
Volume XXVII

JUNE 1941

Number 3

Bulletin
of
The American Association
of
University Professors

Editor

Ralph E. Himstead

Editorial Committee

Joseph Allen

William M. Hepburn

E. C. Kirkland

Louise Pound

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Sts., Easton, Pa.

Editorial Office: 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Issued bimonthly in February, April, June, October, and December. Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions (including Canada) are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

FREDERICK S. DEIBLER (*Economics*) Northwestern University

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

JOHN Q. STEWART (*Astronomy, Physics*) Princeton University

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

LAURA A. WHITE (*History*) University of Wyoming

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

WILLIAM M. HEPBURN (*Law*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1939-1941

BLANCHE H. DOW (*French*) Missouri State Teachers College (Northwest)
 HORACE N. GILBERT (*Economics*) California Institute of Technology
 HORACE M. GRAY (*Economics*) University of Illinois
 CHARLES B. HALE (*English*) University of Maryland
 VICTOR D. HILL (*Classical Languages*) Ohio University
 H. M. HOSFORD (*Mathematics*) University of Arkansas
 ERNEST F. LANGLEY (*Romance Languages*) Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 EVERETT V. STONEQUIST (*Sociology*) Skidmore College
 G. SAFFORD TORREY (*Botany*) University of Connecticut
 EARL L. VANCE (*Journalism*) Florida State College for Women

1940-1942

FRANK L. GRIFFIN (*Mathematics*) Reed College
 FOWLER V. HARPER (*Law*) Indiana University
 HELEN SARD HUGHES (*English*) Wellesley College
 JOHN ISE (*Economics*) University of Kansas
 G. W. MARTIN (*Botany*) State University of Iowa
 ROY F. NICHOLS (*History*) University of Pennsylvania
 H. L. OSTERUD (*Anatomy*) Medical College of Virginia
 HARALD S. PATTON (*Economics*) Michigan State College
 HORATIO SMITH (*French*) Columbia University
 MARIE J. WEISS (*Mathematics*) Tulane University of Louisiana

1941-1943

WILLIAM A. BROWNELL (*Educational Psychology*) Duke University
 JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY (*Mathematics*) Hunter College
 CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN (*English*) Mount Holyoke College
 CHARLES L. JAMISON (*Business Administration*) University of Michigan
 JOHN A. KINNEMAN (*Sociology*) Illinois State Normal University
 ETHEL SABIN-SMITH (*Psychology, Philosophy*) Mills College
 STANLEY S. SWARTLEY (*English*) Allegheny College
 JOHN A. VIEG (*Government*) Iowa State College
 PAUL W. WARD (*Philosophy*) Syracuse University
 E. J. WORKMAN (*Physics*) University of New Mexico

EX-PRESIDENTS

S. A. MITCHELL (*Astronomy*) University of Virginia
 A. J. CARLSON (*Physiology*) University of Chicago
 MARK H. INGRAHAM (*Mathematics*) University of Wisconsin

CONTENTS

CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	294
CULTURE AND THE NEW ANARCHY, <i>T. H. Vail Motter</i>	295
THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY AND THE SCHOLAR, <i>Carl M. White</i>	305
FREE SCHOOLS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, <i>Henry W. Holmes</i> ...	319
THE GROUND FLOOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION, <i>Frederic W. Heimberger</i>	322
THE EXEMPTION OF TEACHERS FROM THE HATCH ACT, <i>Joseph R. Starr</i>	329
ACADEMIC TENURE, <i>Henry M. Wriston</i>	337
SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.....	348
HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.....	358
COMMUNICATIONS	
Inflation in the Endowed Colleges.....	375
ASSOCIATION NEWS	
Regional Meetings.....	384
Chapter Activities.....	389
The 1941 Nominating Committee.....	391
CONTRIBUTORS.....	392
REVIEWS	
College Plans for Retirement Income, <i>Rainard B. Robbins</i>	393
Problems of Adult Education, edited by <i>I. L. Kandel</i> ...	400
The Administration of College and University Endowments, <i>Charles R. Sattgast</i>	403
MEMBERSHIP.....	406
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	415

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

Censured Administrations

Investigations by this Association of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not maintaining conditions of academic freedom and tenure in accordance with academic custom and usage as formulated in the 1925 Washington Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and endorsed by this Association, by the Association of American Colleges, and by representatives of the American Association of University Women, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, the Association of Urban Universities, the National Association of State Universities, and the American Council on Education.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited by this Association either upon the whole of that institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. This procedure does not affect the eligibility of non-members for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list only by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the dates of these actions by the Annual Meeting are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Brenau College, Gainesville, Georgia	December, 1933
John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida (October, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 377-399)	December, 1939
Montana State University, Missoula, Montana (<i>Bulletin</i> , April, 1938, pp. 321-348; December, 1939, pp. 578-584; February, 1940, pp. 73-91; December, 1940, pp. 602-606)	December, 1939
West Chester State Teachers College, West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (March, 1935 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	December, 1935
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri (December, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 514-535)	December, 1939
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee (June, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 310-319)	December, 1939
Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Washington (October, 1940 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 471-475)	December, 1940

CULTURE AND THE NEW ANARCHY¹

By T. H. VAIL MOTTER

Wellesley College

The anarchy in which we somehow manage to exist today is surely more inclusive, more threatening, and more corrosive than anything Matthew Arnold knew when, frightened by the implications of the Hyde Park riots he began, in 1867, his central work of social criticism, *Culture and Anarchy*. It is unnecessary to name the shapes the anarchy of today assumes. Professor Joseph Wood Krutch has named a fearsome variety in his *Modern Temper*, while Spengler's vast theory of collapsing modern culture seems all too soon to be turning into fact.

It is not inappropriate therefore for teachers, who are guardians of a culture, to inquire as to the validity of our position, and of our means of defending it. Professor Lionel Trilling, in his contribution to the *Kenyon and Southern Reviews* symposium, "Literature and the Professors," reminds us that by inheritance from the Romantics and Arnold we receive our letters patent not only to believe in literature and to study it, but to declare our faith abroad. And he asks whether this social function has not deteriorated by convention into the performance, as he puts it, of "levitical chores in the temple of the respected forgotten dead."

It becomes a question of what we profess, of whom we follow. Upon the strength of our conviction hangs our power of communicating through all phases of our work with the world about us. In the face of evidence that that power is slipping from us, we may well inquire whether one cause, at least, is not a weakening of faith in what we profess.

¹ A paper read before the Modern Language Association of America at its meeting in Boston, Massachusetts, December, 1940.

II

Arnold professed culture. "The whole scope of this essay," he wrote in his Preface of 1869, "is to recommend culture as the great help out of our present difficulties; culture being a pursuit of our total perfection, by means of getting to know, on all the matters which most concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world; and through this knowledge, turning a stream of fresh and free thought upon our stock notions and habits. . . . And," he concludes, "the culture we recommend is, above all, an inward operation."

In many quarters these familiar words are no longer meaningful, or relevant to our present difficulties. Four objections come to mind. In the first place, Arnold's views of poetry and its functions, of the nature and operation of the critical process, and of the social force of culture, while forming a remarkably consistent, if elaborate, system, are unfortunately susceptible of misquotation, misapplication and misunderstanding—especially among readers of anthologies. Without the context of the body of his writings, his phrases become either meaningless, or mean the wrong things. And the fact that his system can logically be reduced to the formula, "Poetry equals criticism equals culture," simultaneously obliterates the spirit of his thought and makes wise the simple in the glad possession of an airy nothing.

There is a second means, too, by which Arnold's influence among us is diminished. His fear of "doing as one likes," as he called varieties of opinion, violates a cardinal tenet of liberalism, that truth is derived from the clash of opposites, and that diversity of ideas is a protection against tyranny. In the land of Justice Holmes and Woodrow Wilson there are many who side on this point with John Stuart Mill and against Arnold.

In the third place, the theory of culture appears to be weakened by Arnold's unwillingness to see men of culture, who are elsewhere in the system presented as apostles of equality, entrusted with power. Although the patient reader may be satisfied with Arnold's reasons, he who runs (to whom the doctrine must ultimately appeal if theory is to become practice) rejects.

In a fourth respect Arnold has his special difficulties with Ameri-

can followers. He did not sufficiently understand us. His distress that we were not English was only less than his despair that the English were not gods. Whereas the diversity of creatures in his native isle impelled him to schemes for reducing them to a common perfection, the multitude of American varieties appeared to him as one universal darkness disposed into degrees of shadow. Our besetting sin, he thought, the sin which if persisted in would keep us from salvation, was our tendency to see ourselves as we wished ourselves to be. We are still sinners. It is a characteristically American trait. Yet this Americanism, we are entitled to believe, is no more inimical to culture than is Arnold's Anglicism that saw itself, not as it wished to be, but as it would have the world to be. When, in the 'Eighties, we boasted that our newspapers were the best in the world, Arnold mistook the boast for complacent Philistinism. Instead, it was our way of expressing an ambition and a hope which we had every intention of fulfilling. The apostle of the rule of the best self thus failed to detect how that rule operated among the least complacent people in the world, at the very hey-day of an era of self-improvement.

There is thus much which for the ordinary reading man makes Arnold's system appear an abstraction. Even the powerful democratic implications of *Culture and Anarchy* become obscured in the logical rejections by Arnold of much that then passed for democracy and did not pass his test of perfection. If he is lost, then, as leader for all but the few, who, in these bad days, shall prop our mind?

III

I submit that Arnold's essential spirit lives on in the educational and literary papers of Woodrow Wilson. It is impossible in brief compass even to suggest the wisdom and eloquence of those productions which so powerfully revitalized higher education in America between 1893 and 1909. They present not a logical system, but a single faith in the dynamic power of the human spirit, and in the sole necessity of relating all investigation, all interpretation, all public affairs, to its needs. This is, of course, the "inward operation" of Arnold's culture, the "unum necessarium" of his

system; but in Wilson the point seems everywhere clearly made without tortuous logical argument.

Though both more and less than Arnold in other fields, in the field of education Wilson is the American Arnold. He speaks boldly and without the Englishman's more cautious reserve. American equivalents of the Hyde Park riots left Wilson's faith in the appeal to reason, in the cultivation of diversity, in giving power to the enlightened, stronger rather than weaker. This is nowhere clearer than in the application of the rule of culture to the state of no-culture, or anarchy. Arnold taught that "Individual perfection is impossible so long as the rest of mankind are not perfected along with us." Culture, that is, begins in the realization that enlightenment is not the privilege of the few but the necessity of the many. Arnold called, therefore, for what he termed "a national glow of life and thought."

This is, of course, a plea for the social responsibility of the cultivated, and for general enlightenment. But the concrete mind will find in Wilson a more practical program for its attainment, and one in which the professor of English, as a foster-child of Arnold, appropriately finds his important function. Wilson begins at the beginning, with the training of men. "The college," he wrote in 1909, "is for the training of the men who are to rise above the ranks." Fifteen years earlier he had said, "Every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation, as well as a man of his time." Over and over he stresses as does Arnold the necessity of the study of literature. "There is more of a nation's politics," he says in the famous passage from *Mere Literature*, "to be got out of its poetry than out of all its systematic writers upon public affairs and constitutions." But Wilson expands Arnold's prescription. "I believe," he says, "that the catholic study of the world's literature as a record of spirit is the right preparation for leadership in the world's affairs." Note that the study is more than a species of personal cultivation; it provides an explicit social objective for culture which Arnold only implies when he urges the counsellors of state to follow Socrates and know themselves. Furthermore Wilson adds a vital proviso: that this study is right preparation "if you undertake it like a man and not like a pedant." Humane letters are elsewhere presented

as a corrective to too scientific, factual, or objective habits of thought. Here is one passage from among many:

There is no corrective for it all like a wide acquaintance with the best books that men have written, joined with a knowledge of the institutions men have made trial of in the past. . . . The worst possible enemy to society is the man who, with a strong faculty for reasoning and for action, is cut loose in his standards of judgment from the past; and universities which train men to use their minds without carefully establishing the connection of their thought with that of the past, are instruments of social destruction.

On the social responsibility of culture, Arnold was never so explicit. In his great Princeton Sesquicentennial address, Wilson challenges the man of thought to accept his place in the large world, his responsibility as a trainer of citizens:

It has never been natural, it has seldom been possible, in this country for learning to seek a place apart and hold aloof from affairs. It is only when society is old, long settled to its ways, confident in habit, and without self-questionings upon any vital point of conduct, that study can effect seclusion and despise the passing interests of the day. America has never yet had a season of leisured quiet in which students could seek a life apart without sharp rigors of conscience, or college instructors easily forget that they were training citizens as well as drilling pupils.

Here an authentic American voice speaks to Americans, and warns us of the potency of our calling. In an eloquent passage Wilson admonishes us:

You should not belittle culture by esteeming it a thing of ornament, an accomplishment rather than a power. A cultured mind is a mind quit of its awkwardness, eased of all impediment and illusion, made quick and athletic in the acceptable exercise of power. It is a mind at once informed and just—a mind habituated to choose its course with knowledge, and filled with full assurance, like one who knows the world and can live in it without either unreasonable hope or unwarranted fear. It cannot complain, it cannot trifle, it cannot despair. Leave pessimism to the uncultured, who do not know reasonable hope; leave fantastic hopes to the uncultured, who do not know the reasonableness of failure.

It is apparent that the culture with which Wilson attacks anarchy is dynamic because it is basically a matter of feeling rather than of reason. "Our culture," he tells us in "The Author Himself," "is, by erroneous preference, of the reasoning faculty, as if that were all of us." Wilson recommends the study of institutions and of English literature as "the only practicable common ground for the various disciplines of the modern university curriculum;" and he does so not to add a new scientific system to learning, but to insist upon the human-ness of human beings. Arthur Hallam once dropped a pregnant sentence into one of his learned footnotes on Dante. "The work of intellect," he said, "is posterior to the work of feeling. The latter lies at the foundation of the Man; it is his proper self, the peculiar thing that characterizes him as an individual."

Wilson has made for us the application of this truth to our daily lives as teachers. "I believe," he said, "that there must be some universities in this country which undertake to teach men the life that is in them, by teaching them the disinterested truths of pure science, by teaching them the truths of pure philosophy, and that literature which is the permanent voice and song of the human spirit. . . . There must sound in the halls of the true university this eternal voice of the human race."

IV

There is Wilson's faith. But once more, as in Arnold's case, we have to grant that there are obstacles to its practical acceptance today. Men have come a long way from that trusting devotion which Tennyson and Arnold taught them to give to literature. Ludwig Lewisohn tells how in the nineteenth century men looked to literature as "moral research, a road to salvation, the breath of life." In the passing of that attitude we are reminded of the little church in rural England whose doorway bore the carved inscription, "This is none other than the gate of Heaven." Underneath a traveller once found, pasted there by the Beadle, the notice, "In consequence of the inclemency of the weather, this gate is closed until further notice,"

There are those today for whom literature is no longer the gateway to heaven. They question its power to make us either wise or good, and they find a literary discipline no more efficacious in developing in us Arnold's "right reason" than it was in the case of that President of Yale who proclaimed in his wisdom in 1800 that if Thomas Jefferson were elected, men would see their wives and daughters sold into prostitution.

Naturally, those who profess literature have not been unaffected by a change in the intellectual climate which threatens to blow their house down; and their behavior during the storm has not escaped the scrutiny both of themselves and of others. The symposium to which I have already alluded is a healthy instance of self-examination. Mr. Archibald MacLeish's now famous charge against "The Irresponsibles" instances the concern of those friends of literature and its professors at the passing of the man of letters, and the withdrawal into scientific objectivity of his joint heirs, the writers and the scholars. Their withdrawal, Mr. MacLeish insists, is socially irresponsible, and he summons them to defend culture, whose threatened extinction is the challenge of the age.

Notwithstanding an adroit about-face in critical attitude, and those flaws in reasoning with which Mr. Edmund Wilson and others have taxed Mr. MacLeish, his demand is nevertheless truly in harmony with the function of criticism and with the social importance of the teacher as Arnold and Wilson expounded them. Yet, precisely because of the actual (though unacknowledged) retreat from Arnold's faith in the power of literature, those who are in retreat would dismiss Mr. MacLeish in the manner of Charles Lamb, who cried out, "Hang the Age! I will write for Antiquity!"

But Lamb could say that, though he was born in the year of Lexington and Concord, survived Marie Antoinette and Napoleon, the birth of Belgium, the death of Warsaw, and the first Reform Bill. Lamb could say that because he believed in the power of literature to cut through affairs with its bright searchlight. Those who would cry out with Lamb today paradoxically enough disbelieve in the power of literature and would busy themselves with a substitute. Here is but one more symptom of the intellectual anarchy of our time.

V

How this came about is partly indicated in a book which seems to have suggested Mr. MacLeish's article. I refer to Julien Benda's *La Trahison des Clercs*, in which the intellectual history of Europe is presented in terms of a struggle between the clerk (man of letters, scholar, priest, intellectual) and the layman. The clerk is distinguished by his single devotion to things of the spirit and the non-material. His prime function is to oppose the layman and so maintain a balance in society. Until the nineteenth century, according to Benda, this balance was effectively maintained. What he calls the little wars of the kings raged and passed, but, thanks to the power of the spirit of the clerk in the community, though there were bad men abroad, no man dared to call evil good. But with the nineteenth century came popular movements, romanticism's gift of the "national soul," and the development of national wars, which became wars of national cultures. The treason of the clerk lay in his succumbing to overmastering social forces as he abandoned his sole allegiance to the things of the spirit and identified himself with the material forces of nationalism. "Modern humanity is fully determined," writes Benda with bitterness, "that those who call themselves its teachers, shall be its servants and not its guides. And most of the teachers understand this admirably. . . . All humanity, including the clerks, have become laymen." The book, written some fifteen years ago, carries the dire prophecy that the disappearance of the clerk will leave no obstacle to a war of annihilation.

Mr. MacLeish would remind us that the withdrawn scholar is not necessarily a clerk, for his "Irresponsibles" have abdicated their function of opposing their spiritual allegiance to the materialism of the layman. Wilson shows us, in a passage I have quoted, how America has not produced a class of scholars in aloofness, as had Europe; but he would not suggest thereby that America has produced no true clerks. Wilson's own career shows us that the clerk can, in America, walk with the layman in the world and yet not put off his shining raiment.

Benda excuses the treason of the clerk as the inescapable result of the social conditions imposed upon him. He speaks of the im-

possibility of leading the life of a clerk in the world of today. The clerk, he says, is not only conquered, he is assimilated. But for all his excuses, Benda links the death of the clerk with the death of culture.

VI

We need not fear that the American clerk will so readily submit to the annihilation which the European author insists on. Though those who believe in the spirit of man are fewer among us, they are by no means extinct, nor are they weak or helpless. They can hearten those who have fallen back hopelessly upon fact, they can rally those who feel they are interpreting what nobody believes. Above all, they can get into the long line of scholars, threading in Indian file through the dark forest of criticism and jog them into fresh woods and pastures new. They not only can; they must. For Benda is right in insisting that the existence of a class of men singly devoted to the spiritual is a condition of the survival of free men. The essential rightness of Arnold and Wilson must be actively rediscovered and reapplied in our world.

For he who teaches in the American college is committed by his vocation to the way of Arnold and Wilson, which is the liberal way, and the professor is dedicated to the Liberal Arts and to Liberal Education. If he is not, he should stop using the phrases, for who will long listen after it is apparent that a man does not mean what he says? The professor of English is a link between the past and the future; he is also the interpreter of the present to itself, and of one age to another. In this high calling it is essential that he be understood and that he be believed. The first step toward being believed is to believe. The next step toward being believed is to communicate. There are times when the ivory tower proves a dangerous refuge.

In Wilson's words, "Comprehension must be the soil in which shall grow all the fruit of friendship." We can ponder these words as we consider the Liberal Arts in a program of Liberal Education. They will remind us that it is our duty to make free and to keep free men and ideas. It is our solemn obligation to be free ourselves free from the arbitrary, the capricious, the habitual, whose chains all men must strain a lifetime to break.

They will remind us that the soil of comprehension is the soil of the Liberal Community, one in which a man is free to make his own mistakes, and free to correct them. It is by those tokens therefore a place of growth and learning. It is a place where the strong and experienced lend their strength to those who follow after. It is a place where dwell men like him who, being asked by a fellow college president, "What do you do with difficult faculty members?" replied, "I live with them."

VII

In the Liberal Community is room for no privilege of custom, birth, or power; but only the privilege of leadership achieved through a hard testing open to all equally. It is a community where activity will express itself in almost infinite patterns suited to the needs of its constituents. Surely there is place for variety of method and point of view; for all kinds of good criticism, whether historical or aesthetic, objective or subjective; for the good teacher, the good writer, the good man of letters. For we are myriad men before we are one herd. But all this healthful and essential diversity, with which alone we can outface the terrible and sinister strength of the unitary state, must perforce be based upon one great and common affirmation, stated to Lucilius by Seneca: "You know why liberal studies are so called," he wrote. "Because they are worthy of a free man." A free man in Seneca's time, as we still hope in our own, is a man with civil rights and civil responsibilities.

This, then, is the injunction clearly implicit in Arnold's thought, forcefully explicit in Wilson's: that those who have won leadership in the realm of words, those who assemble, classify and interpret no less than those who create, know, believe, and act on the presumption that they are above all things men in the world, entrusted with the keeping of a fortress more precious than all others, the seat of right reason, defended by personal integrity and a decent respect for the opinion of mankind. If they believe this with the intensity the clerks once gave to God, there will be no books burned in America.

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY AND THE SCHOLAR¹

By CARL M. WHITE

University of Illinois

I propose to review briefly the work of the university library. In so doing, I shall attempt, not a recital of duties performed, but an interpretation of forms of service of interest to the scholar. The discussion throughout will draw the University of Illinois Library into the focus of attention, but I believe about all that is said will have more than local application.

II

The work of checking lists, placing orders, corresponding with dealers and donors and keeping up with accounts in the Order Department may seem offhand to have only a remote bearing on the work of the scholar. But the entire book budget, amounting at the University of Illinois to well over a hundred thousand dollars a year, is spent with two objects in mind—to build up a collection in terms of the actual needs of resident scholars and their students, and to stretch the budget over as many needs as possible. If all needs cannot be covered, the ones are met for which the best cases are made out by those who present them, while the others are allowed to wait. If experience shows that the Library is not getting around to pressing needs within a reasonable time on the budget available, an effort is made to increase the budget, the object in any case being to acquire, one way or another, whatever the scholar really needs. Thus the budget for library additions and the way in which that budget is administered are both governed by a desire to serve the scholar.

Not all acquisitions are made by purchase. In 1936, it was estimated that the University Library received gifts and exchanges

¹ Read before the University of Illinois chapter of the American Association of University Professors on November 18, 1940.

from 13,800 societies, institutions, governmental agencies, etc., from 5300 publishers of newspapers and other periodical publications—in all, some 19,100 issuing agencies from which library materials were received at no cost to the University except the salaries of the assistants, transportation, and the cost of duplicate copies of our own publications used in effecting exchanges. Gifts and exchanges often prove useful in the instruction program, but they are of primary use in rounding out the collection for the scholar.

The direction in which research may lead is not always predictable, so the Division of Gifts and Exchanges holds itself in readiness to "wage campaigns" for those who find themselves in need of material not normally sought by the Library. At the request of one scholar, for example, American Legion publications were solicited from adjutants in every state in the union. At the request of another, a member of the Commerce faculty, forty-four trade unions were requested to send their journals. Other special campaigns for material, conducted on request, have included quests for material on safety education, zoning ordinances, college and university catalogues, labor union newspapers, etc.

Let me pause long enough to remark that the standard measure of the value of a collection to the scholar engaged in research is its completeness.¹ One issue of a county newspaper may be worth next to nothing. However, as a long file of the newspaper ap-

¹ Lest more be read into this statement than is intended, it should be added that no library today can expect to buy everything and that not all material a library can purchase is of equal worth in building a research collection—although the worth of specific items for specific research projects cannot, of course, be known in advance. The financing of research, cooperation in higher education and book selection policies (other than the policy, already stated, that the University of Illinois seeks to acquire, one way or another, whatever its scholars really need) fall outside the scope of this paper; but I may be permitted to quote a significant paragraph from the pen of Dr. Raymond M. Hughes, President Emeritus of Iowa State College: "It is the demands of research that make the university library expensive to maintain. Every type of research, if successful and economical, leans heavily on the library. Unfortunately many institutions attempting rather ambitious research programs have very inadequate libraries. A survey of the university and college libraries of the country leads me to conclude that not over forty or fifty of our institutions have adequate libraries well administered from the point of view of research. Of these half are in institutions which are primarily colleges. Perhaps the separate land-grant colleges, as a group, are most inadequately provided in proportion to their expenditures for research. Many able and useful men who preside over colleges and universities do not grasp the vital importance of the library, and I feel that the responsibility for educating them along this line rests with the librarian and the faculty. . ." (Russell, J. D., ed. "Outlook for Higher Education." University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. 98-99.)

proaches completion, it takes on increasing significance. A separate issue ceases to be merely a relic and becomes part of a contemporary record invaluable to one who is studying the period or locality. At the University of North Carolina is a collection of a million and a half letters, diaries, and plantation records—some written by persons of high estate, others by persons of low estate. Item after item might easily have been consigned by a housewife to a bonfire as worthless, but taken as a whole this Southern Historical Collection brings to life again a whole era and is a veritable mine of information for the scholar who is interested in certain phases of American history. Very often a collection of research material thus consists of items which, taken singly, could not be considered as of much value but which is, when relatively complete, invaluable. That rule tends to apply whether the items in question are newspaper files, nineteenth century textbooks, World War propaganda, land grants, ante-bellum plantation day-books, or clay tablets written in the time of Abraham.

Another means of acquisition is photographic reproduction. Photography has been in the service of libraries a good many years. The un-reduced photostat remains the most popular form of use because it can be read with the unaided eye. Since the middle of the 1930's another form of use, microphotography, has been increasing in popularity. Microphotography refers to a process of reproducing written or printed material photographically in a form which greatly reduces the image photographed. It is too early to predict whether microfilm or microprint will prove the more serviceable; but whatever changes the future may bring, microfilm is for the present the more widely used.¹ The type of

¹ Herman H. Fussler, Head of the Department of Photographic Reproduction of the University of Chicago Libraries, suggests that the distinction between microfilm and microprint be set forth a little more clearly. Since Mr. Fussler's work in the field of microphotography is well known, I shall let the distinction be made in his words, "As currently used, microprint refers to a commercial process . . . of duplicating material on flat sheets of paper. In order to be economically feasible, the process requires an edition, the size of which is as yet uncertain but probably is not less than twenty-five copies. . . . Therefore, it is a supplement to, rather than competitive with, microphotography as we know it at present, and it seems to me in so far as present current technical developments are concerned neither the one nor the other will dominate the field of scholarly reproduction, since they both seem to have a definite place. Microphotography, as you have made clear, permits an edition of one or a few at any time; microprint, as we currently know it, does not."

film used is similar in appearance to that used in the motion-picture industry, but there the similarity ends. The film used in libraries is of a cellulose acetate base and can be stored without increasing the fire hazards present in these libraries, whereas the film used in motion pictures is of a nitrate base and is highly combustible. Tests by the Bureau of Standards show that the stability of films now in use by libraries compares favorably with that of the best grades of paper.

Developed in libraries as a service to scholarship, microphotography aids in the preservation of newspapers and other perishable records, simplifies the storage problem for some material that normally requires a great deal of room and makes accessible at moderate cost material hitherto out of the reach of the average scholar. I shall confine attention to the last-named advantage and mention briefly two ways in which microphotography serves the scholar as a form of acquisition. To date the greatest use that has been made of this new vehicle of communication has been in copying material already published. The most fertile field has been material no longer covered by copyright. Material under copyright can, under certain circumstances not well covered by existing legislation, be copied for the scholar, but cannot be copied for the purpose of rounding out a university library collection. Specifically, a part of a volume can be reproduced photographically, on a non-profit basis, and delivered to a scholar representing in writing that such reproduction is desired as a substitute for a loan or for manual transcription. This arrangement is the result of a gentlemen's agreement with publishers, does not necessarily reflect the attitude of every publisher or of any publisher for all of his publications, and in itself gives neither scholar nor his library any assurance of legal protection in case a publisher claims violation of the copyright law.

The second form of acquisition is publication. The number of studies addressed to limited circles of specialists is increasing; and, as learning becomes more specialized, these circles divide and subdivide. Unless this trend is reversed or unless scholarship receives more generous financial support, the strain on technical journals, monograph series, etc., may be expected to increase. Microphotography offers a certain amount of relief from excessive strain on

these facilities—a means whereby the scholar or his library can secure a single copy of the work on film at a cost comparable to that of a single copy of the same work printed in an edition of two or three thousand. As yet the uses of microphotography for publication are largely potential; but the U. S. Copyright Office will now accept two copies of a film as fulfilling requirements of copyright, and with this assurance of legal protection of intellectual property, this less costly means of communication will perhaps be employed more extensively in the future.

III

While university book budgets have increased rapidly in the last quarter of a century, they have not increased rapidly enough to enable the library to acquire all the books or reproductions of books scholars need for their work. Many of the remaining requirements are met by inter-library loan. There was a time when securing an inter-library loan was a laborious process. A letter of inquiry about the book sought was directed to a neighboring library only to find perhaps that the book was not there. The inquiry was then addressed to another library and then another until the book was located or until librarian and scholar gave up. Today a library is able to discover the whereabouts of unusual books more quickly and economically. A year's correspondence shows that the University of Illinois Library now has to write no more than an average of between one and two letters (1.44, according to a recent survey) for each inter-library loan. The total cost averages approximately \$1.60 for each loan.

The basis of the inter-library loan service is a policy of mutual cooperation among libraries. Occasionally, individual scholars are caused inconvenience by these loans in spite of efforts to avoid it; but the total inconvenience is small when compared with the total benefits to scholarship.

The improvements in this service referred to above are largely the results of various aids such as union lists of library holdings, printed catalogues of the holdings of individual libraries and general descriptions of the contents of others. Such tools have for the most part been created by librarians and represent a service to scholarship which they have consistently sponsored.

Supplementing these tools is the clearing house for inter-library loans at the Library of Congress. Libraries the country over send to the Union Catalog of the Library of Congress typed cards for their out-of-the-way holdings, particularly for those books not in the Library of Congress. Thus it is possible for a university library to inquire where it can find a Civil War pamphlet and learn from the Library of Congress that it is available—possibly—in a college or public library a few miles away. If the pamphlet happens not to be listed in the Union Catalog in Washington, it is listed with other items which cannot be located, and the stronger libraries in the country are circularized within a week to see if it can be found in any of them. In any use of the Library of Congress clearing house, it should be remembered that full and accurate bibliographical information is necessary and, if it turns out that the item sought is not listed in the Union Catalog, it goes without saying that a certain amount of time and patience will be required.

Certain libraries have union catalogues of their own. The one at the University of Illinois contains nearly 3,000,000 cards. Every time a book is added to the Library of Congress a card is sent them as soon as cards for that book are printed. These cards form the nucleus of our union catalogue. To it are regularly added cards from fifteen or sixteen other prominent libraries, most of them in the United States. If a scholar consults the union catalogue and finds no card for the book he wants except one from the Library of Congress, he would be safe in going to the desk and saying, "Secure this from the Library of Congress." He would be safe and it is often done; but it is not the thing to do anyway.

In the first place, the fact that there is no card in the union catalogue from any of the other libraries does not mean that the book is in none of them. The John Crerar Library is the only one that attempts to supply the Library of the University of Illinois with cards for all or nearly all of its acquisitions. Other libraries send only those cards which they themselves print and ordinarily a library will not print cards if they can be purchased from the Library of Congress. Stated in another way, the University of Chicago or the University of Illinois will duplicate the cards printed by the Library of Congress as little as possible, and hence

any union catalogue having cards from all three libraries may find that Chicago and Illinois cards duplicate one another but in general they will both supplement—though they will also sometimes duplicate—the holdings of the Library of Congress.

The second reason why the reference librarian should not be told to get a book from the Library of Congress—although she should be informed that the book is in the Library of Congress—is that she may wish to take certain other matters into account. Suppose, for example, that all American libraries sent the Library of Congress every request for every book needed that is known to be there. Such a load, of course, would be unreasonable if not impossible for it to carry. Realizing this fact, an effort is usually made to use other libraries and save the Library of Congress as a place of last resort.

The inter-library loan represents what we might call the second mile travelled by the libraries of the world in their efforts to help the mature scholar. It is given on the assumption that the borrowing library will try to take care of everyone else, including the basic needs of graduate students, and that even the request on behalf of the mature scholar will be limited to unusual books not readily available elsewhere. It is given on the assumption that, in recognition of the favor conferred, the borrower and the borrowing library will read and cheerfully comply with the conditions laid down for its use—and the conditions laid down vary with libraries and with the type of material borrowed. It is given on the assumption that the book will be used and returned as promptly as possible, thus reducing to a minimum the ever-present hazard of denying its use to someone at home while someone else is being served at a distance—the distance of the second mile.

IV

Returning to the books the library owns, the next step after acquiring them is to organize them for use. It is estimated that the books in the University of Illinois Library occupy over fifty miles of shelving. The schemes of classification used by modern libraries are not perfect but they do bring the books together on the shelves so that most of the material that needs to be con-

sulted at one time can usually be found in one or two places. Stack privileges are sought by scholars and their students largely because libraries are classified. It would be a serious drawback to many of us if books were arranged—say—in the order in which they reach the library, with ten volumes on trigonometry scattered among a million other volumes.

If a scholar is familiar with the printed tables of the classification scheme used by his library and goes to the stacks, he cannot expect to find there, at any one time, all the material the library has on the subject; for some books may be removed for home use, for reserve, or for permanent use in a departmental library. If he wishes to learn what books the library has, by class, he should consult the shelf-list. This little-known catalogue consists at Illinois of 431 drawers of cards adjacent to the dictionary catalogue. There is one card in this file for each title in the library, and these cards are arranged exactly as the books are arranged on the shelves—by subject.

But neither the arrangement of the books on the shelves nor the classed catalogue answers all the questions about the contents of the library that our work at times obliges us to ask. To these questions, the dictionary catalogue provides more answers than any other record. This mammoth bibliography brings author, subject and title cards for all books in the library together in one continuous alphabetical arrangement, thus serving essentially the same purpose as a carefully prepared alphabetical index to a book. For many, unhappily, the analogy may not appear to be wholly satisfactory. Too often those who wish to know what is in the library are left baffled by the card catalogue. Not long ago a professor was troubled because photostats of the "Jacobite Journal," ordered a year earlier, had not been catalogued. He had looked in the catalogue and had found no card for the title. A trip to the catalogue revealed that the photostats had been catalogued, that the title was "Jacobite's Journal," and that there were cards in the catalogue for them in the expected places—that is, under the title, "Jacobite's Journal," farther back in the files than "Jacobite," and also under the subject, *Jacobites*. Year after year scholars ask the Library to borrow books from other libraries when the books are available here and are listed in the card catalogue. The

records reveal that an average of approximately one book in every ten requested on inter-library loan during the last five years is in this Library already, but it is not located until the one making the request gets assistance from a member of the library staff. It would be too much to say that such unnecessary requests are due in every instance to lack of facility in the use of the card catalogue. Nevertheless, there seems to be little doubt that the mature scholar, the same as the less mature student, has his troubles with this formidable tool.

One suggestion may help everyone concerned. Every card in the catalogue is carefully filed by rule. These filing rules are easily learned, but they are numerous enough to make a good-sized pamphlet. It is not necessary to memorize the entire set of filing rules in order to use the card catalogue effectively, but everyone who has to use the library very much ought to get a copy of the rules and master the most important ones. One should know, for example, that all entries are arranged letter by letter to the end of the first word; if that is the same, then by the next word, and so on, with no word (except the initial article) disregarded—*i. e.*, the so-called “nothing before something” rule. And so on through the list.

V

Recently, a colleague commented enthusiastically on the assistance he had received from the Library in locating the address of a friend. The reference staff—and for the purposes of this discussion we might include college and departmental librarians—have at their elbows a wide range of books containing all sorts of information, and they are sufficiently familiar with them to locate immediately a great deal of information which someone without their training might spend hours in trying to locate and then fail. The library should be called freely whenever information of any kind is needed, but to think of the reference service entirely in the light of an information bureau is to set the staff aside as strangers to the ways and real needs of scholars and to lose sight of their ability to assist in research work. The reference librarian holds up for himself the ideal not of stranger to research, but

rather of companion in research. He suffers no illusions that he is a specialist in every field of learning, but he is what we might call a specialist in books and he is, because of that fact, often able to assist the scholar more than the latter might suppose. Let us take an example.

A scholar came to the reference desk with a photostat of the title page of the following:

La / Premiere / et Seconde / Sepmaine / de
Guillaume de / Saluste, Seigneur / du Bartas.
/ A Heidelberg, / MDXCI. /

That was all except the printer's device. The scholar was eager to locate the name of the printer or publisher of this book, but he had himself not been able to do so. Normally a reference librarian would probably have searched in the printed catalogues of certain large libraries of the world to see if the bit of information had been supplied at any previous time; but the scholar knew, in this instance, that the only copy known is in the Royal Library at Copenhagen, so one step was saved. The next logical step would have been to search the works in the subject field, but here again the scholar, who was himself preparing a critical and definitive edition of the work of Du Bartas, was convinced that the possibility of finding the elusive detail in this way was very remote. The only promising clue lay in investigating the printing history of the period. The problem in its final analysis, therefore, became a search for an unknown printer using a given emblem on his works, who was active in Heidelberg in 1591.

The history of contemporary printing offered some difficulty. The fact that a French work was published by a supposedly German press was contrary to the usual custom of sixteenth century presses publishing either in Latin or in the vernacular. Unfortunately the library in which the search was made owned no detailed history of the early Heidelberg presses, so no information concerning local printers and their publications could be obtained from a source of this kind.

This left the identification of the device as the only solution. Bigmore and Wyman's *Bibliography of Printing, with Notes and Illustrations*, was taken from the shelves and a page by page

search begun. The search ended in the C's. Jerome Commelin, a French religious refugee, was established as a printer in Heidelberg in 1591. The entry under his name carried this additional information: "He printed a great number of books which do not bear his name, but are easily traced to him by the device on their title-pages." The following page gave an illustration of the device, "Truth in her glory, holding the sun in her right hand, and in the other an open book and a palm" which corresponded to the emblem on the title-page. The reference librarian, in this instance, knew how to get the books in the library to yield the information that was hidden there all the time better than the subject specialist, not because she knew more about Du Bartas, but because she knew better how to follow the only clue available through the whole library to the exact book which held the information needed.¹

The description of the research assistance the university library seeks to provide the scholar would not be complete without a word about bibliography. There is considerable unevenness in scholars' knowledge of the bibliographical aids to research. This unevenness is my excuse for drawing attention to the value of general, trade and national bibliography as a background for searching thoroughly the literature of any subject field, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. In order to be as specific as possible, I shall arbitrarily pass over works published in English, French, etc., and confine myself to the question, what sort of a picture can be secured of the printed literature of the German people—their books, journals, maps, etc.?

Books currently published in Germany are listed daily in *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel*, but this list is sold only to the trade and is ordinarily not available in libraries. However, a publication which corresponds to our *Publisher's Weekly* is available, the *Deutsche Nationalbibliographie*. This weekly lists all books currently published by the regular book trade and includes many titles outside the trade as well. It goes back, with changed title and scope, to 1842. The picture in retrospect, however, is

¹ The librarian was Miss Georgia Faison, Reference Librarian of the University of North Carolina, to whom I am indebted for the illustration. Space does not permit the use of other illustrations.

easier to get in other ways. The *Halbjahrsverzeichnis* connects with the latest volume of *Deutsches Bücherverzeichnis*, a pillar of any general bibliographical collection and particularly important in a research library. A work may be located by author, subject and sometimes title. Entries include full bibliographical information—author, title, place, publisher, date, volume, paging, series, price of different editions, etc. The subject approach is comprehensive and thorough. It lists, besides books published in Germany, works in German published elsewhere in Europe. *Deutsches Bücherverzeichnis* goes back to 1911 and connects with Kayser's *Vollständiges Bücher-Lexikon*, 1750-1910, which in turn overlaps Heinsius' *Allgemeines Bücher-Lexikon*, 1700-1892. These bibliographies vary somewhat in scope and arrangement; but, through their use, the scholar can, without leaving his library, get a fairly complete picture of the literature of the German people from 1700 to a week or two ago.¹ With the help of a few additional lists, notably Gräse's seven-volume *Trésor de Livres Rares et Précieux* and Brunet's nine-volume *Manuel*, it is possible to reach back and get at much of the material in German to the very beginnings of printing in the fifteenth century. These are not all of the lists that will be found useful in surveying the literature of the German people; but they are basic ones and illustrate the character of the tools essential for thorough bibliographical research.

In view of the limited acquaintance with these more general tools, and in view of the prodigious and unabated increase in the volume of print, graduate faculties may wish to consider how their students, the scholars of tomorrow, may be encouraged to improve this side of their intellectual equipment through study that is more systematic than at present.

VI

In all the work of the Library, a good deal of thought is given to the scholar's convenience. The main building is itself centrally

¹ Because of the war, the file of *Deutsche Nationalbibliographie* in the Illinois Library is three months behind.

located. So far as possible the departments of knowledge which use the most books but which are not served by college or departmental libraries are housed adjacent to the Library. Within the building, cubicles, private studies and seminars are planned to make of working conditions an ally instead of an enemy.

The laboratory sciences are served by college and departmental libraries so that all of the apparatus needed for effective work is close at hand. Special libraries in the main building bring together for mature minds compact collections of material used for purposes of research. Less active material the campus over is retired to the stacks in the main building, the center of library storage no less than of library use. Storage thus serves the dual purpose of keeping special collections active and keeping all material within a given field which the Library owns at least within walking distance of the scholar's office.

Finally, regulations governing the use of books are especially liberal for the scholar. The typical loan made by a library is for a specific period at which time the book is either returned or renewed, the object being to insure smooth movement of books among borrowers. The scholar is treated differently. He is accorded the privilege of borrowing material and keeping it as long as he needs it, provided no conflicting need arises in the meantime. From the standpoint of the individual, this provision is a limitation; but from the standpoint of a community of dependents on the library, it is simply the embodiment of the principle of convenience. There is no quarrel between the university librarian who really has the interests of scholarship at heart and the scholar who really has the interest of others at heart. Both have an obligation to promote good citizenship and smooth movement of books within the community of dependents on the library.

Some books require special care and suitable regulations governing use are imposed to insure the treatment they deserve. A certain amount of inconvenience results, but the bookman seldom complains. He fully recognizes that due care for the longevity of books, particularly certain classes of books, in a research library is a responsibility which the literate cannot escape—the responsibility of one generation of men of learning to another.

VII

These are ways in which the university library seeks to further the interests of the scholar. It seeks to build within his reach a collection of materials that will meet his basic needs, to meet special needs not covered by purchase through inter-library loan, to organize and index the collection for ready use, to provide personal and bibliographical assistance in research. Last, but not least, a sincere effort is made to suit the appointments and the regulations of the library to the convenience of the community of scholars dependent upon it.

FREE SCHOOLS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

By HENRY W. HOLMES

Harvard University

Free schools are intended to prepare a free people to control their own lives. This implies that it is possible in a free country, with the help of education, to reach majority decisions by the use of reason—that is, by facing facts, understanding problems, comparing opinions, and accepting conclusions, no matter how fateful the issues involved may be.

There can be no doubt that the *process* of popular discussion and majority decision can be conducted on a large scale in a democracy, for the American election of Presidents—especially the last election, with its vote of over fifty million—proves it. But the question then remains: Are these decisions likely to be wise? The answer may be that no one can tell in advance, although history certainly provides more instances of wisdom in whole peoples than of wisdom in rulers, whether they were individual autocrats or oligarchies. At least this is true of great questions, such as slavery and religious persecution. But there is another answer, namely, that wisdom in popular decisions depends in part on leadership. Who is to find the facts, present them effectively, and interpret them? How are the problems to be formulated? Who will persuade minorities to abide by the decisions enacted into law? Wisdom seems to depend on keeping wide open the avenues and opportunities of public discussion. It depends also on the services of experts, the responsibility and integrity of leaders, the broadest diffusion of a dispassionate and unselfish approach to issues on the part of those who are in positions of advantage for the study of public problems.

II

Therefore, besides preparing the whole people to face major questions of social policy, the schools must serve as an agency for

selecting the good and the great for positions of leadership. The best minds and the noblest natures must have the fullest opportunities; and the people as a whole must learn to discriminate between demagogues and true experts, leaders, saints, and prophets. There are no infallible measures of leadership; but the entire process of popular education is the best basis so far known for the recognition and development of devotion and ability in combination.

It is a proper demand on free schools, further, that they help the people to *discriminate among the problems on which popular decision is feasible and necessary and those on which expert opinion alone can be trusted*. Teachers cannot be expected to provide for the entire people answers to highly technical questions. So far as a "new social order" depends on wisdom with respect to monetary policy (gold, banking, foreign exchange, tax policies, *e. g.*), who can suppose that the 1,500,000 teachers of 7,200,000 pupils in American schools "know the answers" or can teach them? But the basic moral problems of civilization and the good human life are not "technical." There is nothing too complicated about free citizenship, fairness in business, purity in politics, integrity in international relations, for any teacher or any pupil of average intelligence to grasp. Nor are the conditions of public health, efficient public service, beauty in community planning, or increase of scientific knowledge beyond the powers of ordinary minds to fathom. Free schools need not be seminars in economics or sociology or philosophy to be the seminaries of a moral enthusiasm for social justice and social progress. Teachers need not be propagandists for subversive doctrine nor for the *status quo* in order to make their influence count for change toward the good. Morality is not mere conformity; neither is it rebellion against our established forms of government and the processes of law and orderly advancement of the common weal. Schools have only a basic responsibility toward a better social order—the responsibility for open-mindedness and the development of unselfish concern for the public good.

III

Beyond this, to be sure, schools can be helpful in adjusting individuals to the opportunities for earning and for leisure activities

which the present order provides. Vocational education, health education, and education for the enjoyment of beauty and the expression of religious feeling are permanent elements in the education of a free people. They are in no sense education for contentment merely, but may be made the springs of moral enthusiasm for social advance. The extent to which vocational education, for example, shall be specific and directed toward the immediate adjustment of individuals to the present economic and occupational situation depends on the state of technology to which a nation has advanced. Schools should not be used to prepare young people to accept sweat-shop employment without protest. But they may be adjusted to the detailed demands of factories or farms where machine-techniques have supplanted hand operations. Similarly, schools may help young people to enjoy good movies while they avoid cheap magazines. The moral responsibility of schools is not incompatible with realism in their efforts to fit the talents of youth to the tasks of the day or the special opportunities for enjoyment and enrichment which are present at the moment.

The work of free schools should be based on no blind faith in the goodness of men, nor on a cynical denial of the possibilities in human nature. It should face forward toward the future but without failing to note the needs of the present. The dual function of the schools in adjusting the whole body of the young to the tasks of the nation (but without submission to injustice) and selecting leaders who have both ability and good will should be seen in national perspective; and the effort to fulfill that function should be made a thoroughly national enterprise.

THE GROUND FLOOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By FREDERIC W. HEIMBERGER

The Ohio State University

In recent years many college and university teachers have been vigorous in their criticism of certain employment practices of private industry and business. No group outside the ranks of organized labor has been so vocal and so ready to protest. Low wages, temporary employment and the evasion of continuing responsibility for workers have been targets for a withering fire from the campus—and rightly so. Exclusive unions, seeking special advantages for a particular class or trade while refusing to concern themselves with the problem of labor at all levels, have been branded as selfish and short-sighted. Many of these same teachers, however, have conveniently overlooked an employment practice that is disturbing and unfair to thousands of their colleagues and dangerous to the future of higher education in the United States. While ready to defend workers in office, mine, or factory, they have been unwilling to assert themselves on behalf of less fortunate members of their own profession.

II

What, specifically, is the employment practice demanding the attention of all teachers in the field of higher education? It is the hiring on a temporary basis and at low salaries of numbers of persons of the lowest academic rank, that of instructor, far beyond the possibility of normal promotion or absorption into permanent faculties. The teaching staffs of our colleges and universities are loaded with men and women who know, if they face facts squarely, that they have little chance for advancement in rank or salary, that they will be used as low-cost teachers for five or ten years and then left to their own devices to find livings elsewhere. They know, too, that they are not passing through a well-planned period

of apprenticeship and trial. Merit alone will bring no assurance of either promotion or continuing employment, since the number of apprentices is out of all proportion to the needs of the profession. During their uncertain tenure they are doomed to remain as half-caste members of their respective teaching staffs, accepting a full share of the heavy task of instructing elementary classes but rarely granted the rights and privileges enjoyed by their ranking colleagues. Each lives in the hope that he will be among the chosen few when the day of judgment comes.

III

How did this problem come into being? For years prior to the past decade college and university enrollments and incomes had grown rapidly. Faculties were enlarged rather hastily and many comparatively young persons were advanced to positions of high rank and salary. The effect was not bad as long as budgets increased from year to year. Continuing expansion allowed normal promotion for younger teachers. But the situation was quite different when incomes from fees, gifts, endowments or legislative appropriations began to fall off. During the past ten years student enrollments have not decreased appreciably but college and university purses have flattened decidedly. Faced with the imperative need for balanced budgets our institutions of higher education had the choice of several alternatives. One was to reduce the size of teaching staffs and maintain existing salaries, ranks, and standards for promotion. This was rejected in most cases as unfair to students who would be crowded into excessively large classes. Another possibility was that of flat reductions in salaries, allowing ranks to continue as before. While many schools found it necessary to take this step there was great reluctance to abandon salary scales reached after years of pleading with legislatures and boards of trustees. There was still another alternative, more in the nature of following the path of least resistance than the adoption of a thoughtful plan. This practice seemed to preserve reasonably adequate salaries for the upper ranks while meeting the need for enough teachers to prevent crowded classes. It was, in effect, to freeze existing salaries and ranks by reducing

promotions to the vanishing point while taking care of the teaching load by increasing the number of low-cost instructors and even part-time assistants. This practice has been followed to a degree by most of our colleges and universities during the past ten or twelve years. Those who worried about its justice and wisdom were able to find solace in the thought that the situation was only temporary. Now it is clear that there is no prospect of change in the immediate future and it is high time to examine this employment policy and the effects of its continuation.

IV

From the point of view of the upper ranks the practice of hiring an excessively large number of low-cost teachers may appear as a happy solution. There is little increase in the teaching load and salaries are not reduced too much. But the system is filled with injustice and discouragement for the instructor who bears the brunt of its hardships. At first he is immensely pleased with his appointment, feeling that he has finally broken into the profession after two, three or four years of graduate study. The pay is low and the teaching load heavy—but what of it? Growth in scholarship, teaching ability and experience will bring advancement. Then, slowly but surely, the instructor begins to realize that there will not be enough promotions to go around when he reaches the end of his apprenticeship. Perhaps he is confronted with a fixed limit of five or six years in which to gain higher rank or find other employment. A well-planned program of study and development is out of the question. He must attract attention. If he does not he will be only one of many capable teachers who will not be elevated to the permanent faculty. Wide reading and study, so necessary to the acquisition of a background that is broad and deep, must give way to narrow concentration leading to “scholarly” publications. Frequently the instructor is tempted to rush into print before he has begun to master his subject. If he can get other notice, even through antics and affectations that are cheap and tawdry, so much the better. His name will stand out when the day of decision arrives. Administrators who would never hear of him as a quiet but effective teacher and scholar will know

of him as a public character. This is not to say that publicity is the only way to promotion but, among many persons of comparatively equal ability, it is a mighty big help.

V

Now let us consider the capable instructor who, after five or six years of so-called apprenticeship, cannot be promoted to permanent rank. At the age of thirty or more he is compelled to look for a new position. Sympathetic colleagues are willing to give him the best of recommendations, explaining that budgetary inadequacies prevent his advancement and limits on tenure preclude continuing employment. Perhaps some other institution can find a place for him. The unfortunate instructor soon finds that other colleges and universities do not want cast-offs. They prefer to take chances with younger persons, perhaps brilliant, possibly dull, rather than to accept one who has proved his ability through years of teaching but has not been able to advance in rank. If our instructor is unable to find another position, tenure rules may be waived so that he can be continued on a yearly basis as an act of charity. While his immediate future is assured by this act of kindness he is likely to be deeply discouraged and hurt, feeling that he is being tolerated but not wanted.

The practice of appointing large numbers of temporary instructors and assistants to carry the burden of introductory courses has an almost equally bad effect upon students. Frequently these courses are of greater lasting importance and are more difficult to teach than are those confined to narrowly specialized fields and offered to students whose interests are reasonably well established. Qualified educators stress the need for expert teaching on the lower levels but current practice often results in just the opposite. The use of many inexperienced teachers as a way of reducing the total cost of instruction must have an adverse effect upon students during their introduction to higher education. To top it all, many instructors will be dismissed in favor of a new crop of beginners just when they have gained the experience necessary for good teaching. The high mortality rate among first and second

year students may be due in some degree to a disproportionate rate of turnover among members of the lowest academic rank.

This employment practice may also have a serious effect upon the future quality of our faculties. One argument advanced in its favor has been the contention that, however unfair to instructors, it is necessary in order to pay salaries high enough to retain the services of those of the upper ranks. One has the feeling, however, that the loss of persons of great potential ability who refuse to enter the profession because of its early hardships and uncertainties is far more damaging than the occasional but more spectacular withdrawals of those of higher ranks. The young man of promise is likely to be influenced far more by an assurance of advancing on merit to a salary of \$3000 at thirty-five than by the prospect of receiving \$6000 or more at fifty. Once in the profession and reasonably certain of a moderate but adequate salary and continued employment the attraction from outside loses much of its force. But, if the young man knows the present situation and is realistic, he cannot but hesitate at the prospect of dismissal for want of promotion after years of honest and capable effort. Of course there is no dearth of applicants for instructorships in our colleges and universities but there is a serious question as to whether or not the best available material is being recruited for the faculties of twenty or thirty years hence.

VI

What is to be done about this whole situation? First of all, teachers and administrators must face budgetary limitations squarely. There are no present indications that we are passing through a temporary period of reduced institutional incomes. A new period of expansion seems remote, to say the least. It is time to stop temporizing and start searching for a better solution of this difficult problem. What the solution will be defies prediction. It must result from organized and intensive study undertaken jointly and on a national scale by teachers and administrators. One may suggest, however, three basic principles to be observed in any proposed solution. First—There must be a dis-

tribution of ranks and salaries in such a way as to permit the normal absorption of instructors into permanent faculties with no more than a reasonable allowance for the dismissal of those who are not qualified. This will not be easy. It will be opposed by all who regard their present ranks and salaries as vested interests, but it is essential to any solution worthy of the name. Second—There must be a new realization of the importance of elementary courses and the quality of teaching necessary for a proper introduction to higher education. This will mean an end to the easy rationalization that almost any apprentice is able to perform such drudgery. Third—Every instructor must be selected with a view to his potential value as a continuing member of the profession rather than as a low-cost teacher who can be used for a time and then dismissed before gaining the right to continuous tenure.

Difficult as it may seem, a satisfactory employment policy for the campus can and must be worked out. Surely university teachers and administrators are not incapable of setting their own house in order. Failure to do so up to now has been due to several reasons. Existing professional associations are, on the whole, dominated by teachers of the higher ranks who, being human, are willing to let well enough alone and not endanger the advantages they now enjoy, sometimes at the expense of their fellows. Instructors are reluctant to organize for effective action lest they antagonize superiors whose opinions have much to do with promotion and continuing employment. Administrators contend that they dare not act since the necessary changes put in effect by a single college or university would threaten it with the loss of outstanding scholars to other institutions able to offer higher top salaries. Finally, wishful thinking that something would turn up has led many campus Micawbers to avoid this thorny problem entirely.

Common justice, the interests of students, and the future quality of our faculties demand an immediate and thorough investigation of this problem.

NOTE: In his transmittal letter to the editor, the author of this article said:

"With a view to bringing this problem [that of what to do with the many instructors who cannot be promoted because of limited funds and cannot be retained because, as disappointed and even bitter persons, they are likely to be disgruntled makers of trouble] to attention, I have written the little article enclosed with this letter. It is no masterpiece, and it offers no solution. Its sole purpose is to start discussion and thought on this question. My hope is that, if you do not find it to be too amateurish, it will be printed in the *Bulletin* in the near future. Since I am an instructor, perhaps there is some selfishness back of my views. I like to think that I am truly interested in the welfare of students and the whole of higher education, as well as in seeking justice for instructors.

"In this article I am sometimes in debt to the Ohio State University Faculty Committee on Departmental Organization, Procedure, and Control, of which I was a member for two years. On all matters of interpretation and opinion, however, I am presenting my views as an individual, whether or not they coincide with those of the committee."

The rôle of instructors in our institutions of higher education has long been of concern to the American Association of University Professors. Some evidence of this concern is the Association's insistence that academic tenure be disassociated from academic rank, a viewpoint which is now definitely recognized in the 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure agreed upon by representatives of the Association of American Colleges and of the American Association of University Professors. Continuous tenure for the instructor, however, is by no means a solution for the whole of the problem. The profession must be willing to consider measures and adjustments that will make it possible for young men and women who have demonstrated their fitness to be admitted to the academic profession to be given status and compensation commensurate with their worth. This may involve a curtailment in the output of graduate schools. The *Bulletin* of the Association invites and welcomes an expression of opinion and viewpoints concerning this problem which obviously is of great concern to all who are interested in the welfare of higher education.

—THE EDITOR

THE EXEMPTION OF TEACHERS FROM THE HATCH ACT

By JOSEPH R. STARR

University of Minnesota

EDITORIAL NOTE: On May 14, 1941, the General and the Associate Secretaries of the Association and Professor Joseph R. Starr, of the University of Minnesota, appeared as representatives of the Association before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives at a hearing in reference to the exemption of teachers from the Hatch Act, known officially as "An Act to Prevent Pernicious Political Activities." Representatives of the Association participated in this hearing on the invitation of the Hon. James E. Van Zandt, member of Congress from Pennsylvania. General Secretary Himstead spoke briefly of the reasons for the Association's interest in the Hatch Act. Associate Secretary Hepburn presented and commented upon the resolution concerning the Hatch Act adopted by the last Annual Meeting of the Association on December 31, 1940. Professor Starr presented the prepared statement printed below. All three representatives of the Association answered numerous questions put to them by members of the subcommittee.

The bad effects of the second Hatch Act upon the staffs of educational institutions, particularly the land-grant colleges and universities, were pointed out while that Act was under consideration in Congress in the spring of 1940. A clause designed to exempt educational and other similar institutions was introduced as an amendment by Senator Brown. This amendment was passed by the Senate, but was rejected by the Judiciary Committee of the House, and thus did not become part of the law. In its report, the committee failed to state any reason for refusing to exempt teachers from the terms of the Hatch Act. The report clearly revealed, however, the belief of the committee that the prohibition against political activity applied to teachers in institutions receiving federal funds.

The Civil Service Commission, which is charged with important

responsibilities in the enforcement of the Hatch Act, has announced its belief that the Act applies to teachers in the land-grant colleges and universities and vocational teachers in the high schools. In reaching its opinion with reference to the land-grant colleges and universities, the Commission apparently relied in the main upon the terms of the original Morrill Act of 1862. That act set up funds which are of the nature of a general endowment by the federal government in support of education in the states. Yet, as the Commission has pointed out, the Hatch Act cannot be regarded as applying generally to the whole staff of a land-grant college or university, because the first Morrill Act prescribed certain limitations upon the expenditure of the funds. The second Morrill Act of 1890 and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 prescribe still more limitations in the expenditure of federal funds in support of education, so that under judicial interpretation the Hatch Act might prove to have a narrower application in the educational world than the Commission has indicated. An examination of all the statutes involved only serves to further emphasize the inequalities in the effects of the Hatch Act as regards teachers. Some institutions are affected by the Act because they receive federal funds, while private colleges are exempt. Within a land-grant college or university or in a high school, some teachers are subject to the Hatch Act while others are not. All teachers should be exempt from that Act in so far as it is inconsistent with sound principles of academic freedom and tenure.

II

A new section similar to, but somewhat differently worded than, the original Brown amendment should be inserted into the Hatch Act, in order to remove the many doubts about its application to educational personnel. What is wanted is a formula that will protect the legitimate freedom of thought, expression, and political action of teachers, while at the same time not going too far and creating a privileged class. The teaching profession, in asking exemption from the Hatch Act, is not seeking a license to interfere in politics in a manner inconsistent with the position of its members as the intellectual leaders of youth. It is only asking that the rules of academic freedom and tenure, which have been

worked out as a result of generations of experience and which are being constantly improved by negotiation between teachers and the governing authorities of educational institutions, be left undisturbed and unaffected by a piece of legislation that imposes new rules of conduct upon only a part of the members of the profession.

These purposes could be accomplished by the insertion of a new section, as follows:

Sec. 22. For the purposes of the second sentence of Section 9 (a) and the second sentence of Section 12 (a), the term "officer or employee" shall not be construed to include any officer or employee of any educational, research, or cultural institution, establishment, or agency, who is not classified under the federal or a state or municipal merit or civil-service system.

The second sentence in each case is the passage which prohibits all affected persons from taking "any active part in political management or in political campaigns." This is the only part of the Hatch Act that has any undesirable effect upon teachers, and the only part from which they need exemption. If this section were inserted into the Act, teachers, in so far as they are affected at all, would continue to be subject to the prohibitions contained in Section 2, and in the first sentences of Sections 9 (a) and 12 (a). These passages prohibit the use of official authority in elections, and they should continue to apply to educational administrators and teachers to the same degree as to all other public employees who come within their terms. The use of official authority by persons connected with education would be just as pernicious as by persons connected with any other governmental function. The opportunities for the use of such influence by educational administrators and teachers are probably rare, yet it would be wise to let the prohibition stand. The members of the teaching profession are not seeking any special privilege. They do not seek the privilege of entering politics as teachers, nor any opportunity to exploit the title "professor" for the purpose of influencing other voters, no matter how small that influence might be. They ask only to be guaranteed the continued enjoyment of their political rights as private citizens.

This new section would also leave teachers in state and local institutions which receive federal funds subject to Section 12 (a) (2), which prohibits the participation in any way in the solicitation of funds for political purposes from other persons who are also subject to the Act. There is nothing objectionable in this passage as it affects teachers.

The words "educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, or cultural," as used in the original Brown amendment and also in S. 1025 (pending in the present session) by the same author, are, in my opinion, too broad in some respects and tend to include too much, while being too narrow in at least one respect. The words "religious. . . . philanthropic" should be omitted as unnecessary. There are probably no governmental agencies that could properly be classified as either religious or philanthropic. Such agencies are private in character, and are therefore not affected by the Hatch Act, even if they do receive federal funds. It is therefore unnecessary to exempt them.

"Eleemosynary" should be omitted because, if included in the proposed legislation, it might restrict the application of the Hatch Act in a way that would be inconsistent with its general language. There are a number of governmental agencies, national, state, and local, that are properly classified as eleemosynary, and it is highly important that their employees be subject to the prohibition against political activity. The provisions of the original Hatch Act designed to prevent the use of relief funds for political purposes might be undermined by the inclusion of this word in the proposed legislation. These provisions have met with such unanimous approval that it would be unfortunate to weaken them in any way.

There is one type of institution, namely, research agencies, which might not be covered by the remaining words ("educational cultural"). Many research agencies are governmental and some of them receive federal funds. They are in essentially the same position as educational and cultural institutions. Their staffs should enjoy full freedom of political thought and action. The word "research" should therefore be included in the enumeration.

III

There is also the possibility of a conflict between the principle of exempting the staffs of academic institutions from the effect of the Hatch Act and the long-established civil-service rules which prohibit political activity. Some educational administrators and teachers are already members of the classified civil service, whether of the federal service as in the schools of the Indian reservations, or of states as in the State Departments of Education, or of cities as in the regular elementary and secondary schools. These persons are usually prohibited from engaging in political activity by the rules of their respective services. If no special provision were made in the proposed exempting clause to meet this situation, the result might be that an act of Congress would override, or attempt to override, a civil-service rule that has proved its worth in many jurisdictions. It has been the policy of Congress for a long time to guard civil servants against any obligation to render political service, and there probably is no desire to alter that policy. The proposed legislation should therefore contain a provision to ensure against a possible conflict with civil-service rules. The suggested phraseology draws a distinction between nonclassified and classified public employees, and the exemption would apply only to the former.

The proposed amendment to the Hatch Act would accomplish all that can reasonably be expected by members of the teaching profession, and at the same time it would not have too broad an effect, tending to defeat the purposes of the Act. This amendment would place teachers and research workers in institutions and branches of institutions which receive federal funds on exactly the same footing with respect to political activity as their colleagues in private institutions, or in public institutions which receive no federal funds. Its application would be limited to educational and closely related institutions. But it would not invade established civil services, and exempt some persons who are subject to civil-service rules from the prohibition against political activity, while leaving others subject to that ban. It would permit political activity only by academic persons who are not bound by civil-service rules, and who do not enjoy the guaranties of civil servants.

IV

Academic persons, as defined above, should be exempted from the terms of the Hatch Act for the following reasons:

1. The Hatch Act, in so far as it applies to teachers, runs counter to the generally accepted principles of academic freedom and tenure. Academic freedom should include the fullest possible freedom of expression of political thought. It is not enough for teachers to be free to express their political opinions short of actual participation in election campaigns and in campaigns involving only nonpartisan candidates and issues. Teachers should not be in danger of losing their positions because some piece of scholarly writing, or some remark, may be used by another person for political purposes. Teachers should also have the right, like other citizens, to advocate the political views which they believe in and to promote the election of the candidates whom they favor. The full enjoyment of political rights includes the right to participate at will in electoral campaigns, and to become a candidate for elective office. It is particularly important to protect teachers in the full enjoyment of political rights. Their responsibilities as the intellectual leaders of youth demand candor and honesty in the expression of opinion. Young people are the first to detect any evasion on the part of their teachers, and will despise them for it; but with the Hatch Act as a threat in the background, the teacher has little choice in the matter.

The Hatch Act introduced in a roundabout manner a new and undesirable principle of academic tenure. It brought it about that teachers might in some circumstances be dismissed from their positions because they dared to offer themselves to the voters of their communities as candidates for elective office, or because they engaged in some other political activity which is prohibited by the Hatch Act as interpreted by the Civil Service Commission. Moreover, this new rule of tenure was established by legislation which is not general in effect. It applies only to some educational institutions and to some teachers. The inequalities of the Hatch Act are perhaps its worst feature with reference to the educational world.

The institution which employs a violator of the Hatch Act may, of course, defy the order of the Commission and refuse to dismiss the offender. In that case, the institution itself suffers a monetary penalty which is enforced by withholding a part of its federal grant. This would not be serious if only a few isolated cases were involved; but if a vigorous enforcement of the Hatch Act were undertaken, it would probably be found that there are many

instances of minor and even major violations and some institutions might find themselves crippled by the lack of funds.

2. The Hatch Act, in so far as it affects teachers, deprives the state and the political parties of the possibly valuable services of a highly trained class of citizens. There has been a tendency in recent years to remove more and more classes of citizens from active participation in politics. The civil service has been vastly extended at all levels of government; the Department of Agriculture has ordered all members of A. A. A. committees to refrain from political activity; the Hatch Act placed a ban upon political activity by a considerable number of government employees. Yet the essence of democracy is a broad participation in politics by an alert and well-informed citizenry. Successive limitations of the political rights of more and more groups of citizens may very well weaken the democratic form of government at the time when it is already facing the greatest crisis in history.

3. The Hatch Act, in so far as it affects teachers, interferes with certain kinds of research projects of social scientists. For example, a political scientist might, as part of a legitimate research program, wish to serve as a watcher at the polls. Some projects of this sort have actually been conducted, in which both teachers and students have participated, with excellent results in exposing electoral malpractices. The rules of the Civil Service Commission, which would apply in such a case, forbid any participation at the polls other than the act of voting. Political scientists, who have to teach their students about election administration, political conventions, direct primaries, and so on, should have the right to inform themselves about such matters by direct participation.

4. The Hatch Act, in so far as it affects educational institutions, runs counter to the long-established principle that the schools, colleges, and universities should be autonomous and allowed to retain control over their own affairs. For purposes of the Hatch Act, educational institutions are treated as merely subordinate parts of the executive branch of government. The term "state or local agency," as used in the Act, is defined therein as meaning the executive branch of government. The House Judiciary Committee, when reporting on the amending Act of 1940, stated that, in its opinion, educational and other similar institutions are included under the term "state or local agency." This invades the substantial independence which schools, colleges, and universities have been allowed to enjoy.

If a traditional policy towards education is to be overthrown, it should be done openly and deliberately, and not in a roundabout way as in the Hatch Act. If great state universities are to be made subject to the United States Civil Service Commission, they

should be warned in advance and given an opportunity to show why they should remain independent. Especially if the political rights of teachers are to be curtailed by law, that law should be one of general and uniform application. Congress does not have the power to enact a law placing all schools, colleges, and universities under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission and limiting the political rights of all teachers. Therefore, the logical and wise procedure is to modify the existing legislation in such a way that it will not have these effects upon some academic institutions and some teachers.

ACADEMIC TENURE¹

By HENRY M. WRISTON

Brown University

The problem of academic tenure has become acute within American universities and colleges. The slowing down of growth in student bodies after abnormal periods of expansion, the slackening of the flow of gifts after extraordinary periods of philanthropy, the fashion of the hour for "social" security, the curtailment of academic freedom, and the destruction of tenure in other nations make this a lively question.

II

These factors explain the incidence of the problem, not its substance. The source of tenure is its relationship to academic freedom. Tenure is regarded as a major guarantee of freedom because it puts the instructor beyond the easy reach of administrative tyranny or the quixotism of governing boards. That there has been tyranny needs no demonstration. College administrators are human, and they hold power. Wherever humans hold power there is a temptation to tyranny; and where there is temptation there is yielding. The quixotism of boards of control likewise rests upon basic human traits and needs neither argument nor demonstration. Anyone who has been long in the land must have seen enough instances without having his memory needlessly prodded. It suffices to say that the most common form of this quixotism appears in the irrational position that one bad man can do more harm than many good men can offset. The old saw about the bad apple in the barrel is one of those insinuating but desperately untrue analogies, for it is built upon the monstrous proposition that good people exercise no influence at all while bad people are dominant. It is a defeatist parable that makes utter

¹ Reprinted from *The American Scholar*, Vol. 9, No. 3, Summer, 1940.

nonsense of education but it has had a profound influence upon the generation now in control of colleges.

The curse of freedom from the point of view of governing boards and administrative officers is that it means freedom for the fool as well as the wise man. Unfortunately presidents and boards (and the public) cannot always distinguish the wise man from the fool. Indeed, the cup of hemlock is more likely to be pressed upon Socrates than upon Babbitt. The crowd usually will shriek for the crucifixion of one who raises awkward issues but will let the scribes and Pharisees pass quietly through their midst. Wisdom and folly are relative terms and the appraisal comes best long after the wise man and the fool are both dead. If by some process of relativity in time and space presidents and boards could now decide effectively what should have been done a century ago we might better trust their judgment concerning the wise and the foolish.

Since we must deal with men and situations here and now we need to set controls upon our judgments, following the procedure with which the Constitution has made us familiar—limitations upon the governing power. Life tenure for judges has kept many a poor judge on the bench but it has protected many more just judges from removal. Tenure for teachers rests upon the same foundation.

There is a second reason why tenure is associated with freedom. Not only do we imperfectly distinguish the wise man from the fool, but it is unsafe to limit freedom by insistence upon established canons. This is peculiarly true in the university, which exists not alone to transmit but to explore. The fact that a canon is "established" puts it beyond the exploratory stage. The essence of research is to destroy established ideas by substituting better ones. During the last thirty years the most completely revolutionary thinking has been that of the physicists. It makes the radical doctrines of the Marxists pale by comparison. One might even argue that over the long pull the revolutionary thought of the physicists and their fellow scientists may affect human life much more profoundly. Yet the demand for a holiday in science is not taken seriously, whereas the Red hunt makes its periodic headlines. The revolutionary character of thought can be cur-

rently identified no more readily than the distinction between a wise man and a fool. For research "safety first" is a wholly inappropriate slogan. The object is change, change as rapid and as fundamental as possible, so long as it is upon a basis of scientific integrity.

III

As in research, so in creative work; canons of good taste do not offer safe limitations upon freedom. What is at one moment in good taste is abominable at the next. Watches that drip off tables would not have appealed to Rembrandt. Houses that look like box cars would not have seemed esthetic to Wren or Bulfinch. The conscious crudities of Gauguin and the congregated dissonances of Hindemith would in other times and to other eyes and other ears seem in bad taste. Good taste is established by prevailing opinion, often transient. Though a majority vote is a useful way of determining upon action it has never been pretended, even by its most ardent advocates, that it is a measure of wisdom or good taste. Whether we are now in the midst of a revolution in our conception of art, whether we are in the midst of a period of arid and foolish experimentalism, whether our collective leg is being pulled, I do not know. As an individual I have a right to an opinion; as an administrative officer my opinion is irrelevant as a basis for displacing an "artist" member of the faculty.

Even when we pass from research and "creative" work to the subject of teaching we must protect the revolutionary. If minds are to be wakened and intellects sharpened there must be a challenge. How sharp that challenge is to be depends upon the teacher's method, upon the fixity of the student's prejudices, the profundity of his ignorance, the keenness of his mind, and many other factors. One of my professors was displaced for a statement I had heard him utter many times. It was a provocative statement about the church; it never stirred me out of my rut and I never heard one of my fellow students refer even remotely to his remark as "radical" or "subversive." Indeed it influenced, so far as I could judge, only the president.

Among all the instances wherein I have seen the tenure of a teacher impaired or destroyed on an issue which involved freedom of opinion within his field of teaching and research I have never known one where the merits were all on one side. Usually the man was asking for trouble. Usually, on the other hand, the institutional representatives handled the issue ineptly or unfairly—and in every instance the gains resulting from his displacement were more than offset by the losses.

IV

Tenure which assures freedom is a gesture of strength. It is said that we want to protect that which we hold dear, but it is much more to the point to say we do not betray nervousness over positions we regard as impregnable.

The pressures upon freedom are often evidences of doubt as to the essential strength of our citadel. Religion has frequently offered a barrier to freedom. However, perspective alters opinion. We now laugh at the qualms of the church over the ideas and demonstrations of Galileo. At his grave in the church of Santa Croce I once heard a guide make sport of the issue. We are contemptuous of the more recent uproar over the impact of "Darwinism" upon faith and make mockery of the "Bible belt" states where legislation still attempts to protect education from subversive scientific attacks upon faith. It has been common to assert that this was an indication of the great importance of religion in the life of earlier times and to argue that the legislation is now a protection for religion in those "backward" areas where it is still regarded as vital. But another interpretation seems to me infinitely superior—namely, that men of science and men of faith are both occupying stronger positions than before and realize there is no essential conflict between them. Science has altered its hypotheses radically; its boundaries and potentialities have been surveyed more realistically; it describes life but does not answer its riddle. Physics sets metes and bounds upon its work; then yields to metaphysics. Religion on its part no longer regards some of its old positions as religious at all, and having abandoned them finds itself not weakened but freed of embarrassments.

Science and religion are each ready further to modify its position as knowledge of itself and its old opponent grows richer. Tolerance is a gesture of assurance.

We should keep that point firmly in mind as we turn from consideration of an old controversy to a current issue. The zone of freedom which tenure seeks to protect today is in writing and teaching about things economic and political. It is usually said that the reason for difficulty is the greater importance of the social structure in the life of today, the greater degree of interdependence in the modern age, which must inevitably limit the freedom of the individual.

This is a variant of the argument we confronted in the historic clash between science and religion and involves a like misinterpretation of the facts. Interdependence has reduced the pressure upon individuals. Engineering has limited the effectiveness of the state. No longer may the spoken word be censored as it flies through the ether, save by means more drastic, more difficult and less effective than ever before. Censorship, inhibitions upon freedom are not manifestations of power; they are essentially defensive. They reflect doubt—lurking, deep-seated, profound, and devastating doubt—as to the strength, even the reality, of the things they seek to protect. Limitations upon freedom do not come because economics and politics are more vital than at earlier times but because they are less effective. Ideologists put hard shells about the soft cores of their doctrines. The urgency of indoctrination and the destruction of tenure (the swiftest pressure upon teachers) are the clearest evidence of internal weakness.

We have come, it seems to me, to the heart of the problem of academic freedom as it affects tenure. It is not imperiled by strength but by weakness; it is not menaced by confidence but by doubt. And what is true of academic freedom in general is true of freedom within particular universities and colleges. Difficulties are rare in institutions which are sure of their mission and intent upon the pursuit and exposition of truth. Only where expansion of material assets is more important than widening intellectual horizons do freedom and tenure suffer. The sense of insecurity within an institution must be very serious indeed if its foundations can be shaken by the breath of a public speaker.

The fears so often expressed that an institution may be damaged by the incautious or unwise utterance of some professor reveal the want of faith in the solidity and reality of the institutional structure.

V

If freedom is the mark of strength, tenure is its symbol. For tenure is the guarantee to the individual that his freedom is real and not a shadow. However, it should never be mistaken for the substance of freedom. Some people have personalities so vibrant and ideas so lucid and appealing that they may be effectively free even in prison. The power of their teaching conquers every obstacle. Death itself may add potency to their ideas. They rise above the protection of tenure. At the other end of the scale are men with so little soul force and so poverty-stricken in their gift of expression that with a world-wide radio broadcast at their disposal they would make no impact. Tenure is no protection for what one is incapable of using.

That statement gives the cue to the most important limitation upon tenure. The term "academic tenure" is seldom precisely defined but it is never absolute. It is not "life" tenure, for it is usually subject to retirement rules. It is always dependent upon the solvency or fiscal exigencies of the institution. It does not give protection against punishment by civil or military authorities for illegal acts. Overt acts of immorality furnish a basis for displacement. Finally, and most important, tenure does not preserve the position of a negligent or incompetent teacher. Its only effect in such cases is to put the burden of proof upon those who seek to displace him. If he has had a period of probation and no substantial change in the conduct of his work can be shown, that burden of proof is very heavy indeed. But if deterioration in the quality of his teaching can be shown, the burden is not so severe. Admittedly proof of ineffectiveness is difficult, and fear of facing the issue on the part of administrative officers has made academic tenure appear to protect shoddy work. The real protection of poor teaching is not tenure, however, but lack of skill or want of courage on the part of the responsible officers of the institution.

There is one other aspect of the relationship of tenure to freedom which receives far too little attention yet it is of first-class importance. As the symbol of freedom, tenure is effective only if it represents the free grant of the governing board as a voluntary restriction of its own freedom of action and as a gesture of confidence. Sometimes the source of formal rules of tenure defeats their essential purpose. If they are wrung as unwilling concessions from a reluctant board, jobs may be protected but not freedom. There are dozens of ways of persecuting, nagging and harassing the teacher which can sap the substance of the protection tenure is designed to give. Pressure group techniques are not sound procedures in any government, and in an institution devoted to the search for truth and its exposition such techniques destroy the kernel even when they salvage the shell.

The spirit which animates the institution is vastly more significant than the forms of its procedure. I have known institutions which clung to the absurd procedure of annual contracts where faculty tenure was really as secure as in any institution in America. On the other hand the most elaborately devised and safeguarded legislation regarding tenure was sent me by an institution only a few weeks before a group of its faculty was suddenly deprived of its positions, upon grounds which were transparently flimsy. Both these cases were exceptional and extreme but they serve to remind us that the characteristic American faith in legislative enactment is even more badly misplaced in this matter than in most others.

VI

The problem of tenure has become unusually acute because the times are out of joint. The market situation in the teaching profession has had a profound effect. Just before the World War, and again just afterward, there was a surge of students; colleges and universities grew rapidly and junior colleges sprang up like weeds. Consequently there was an intense demand for teachers and jobs were plentiful. Standardizing agencies, like the Association of American Universities, and the great regional associations, like the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary

Schools, published "approved lists" of institutions and virtually required advanced degrees. This broadened the market for trained scholars even more. At the same time the great foundations were pouring out money to the capital funds of institutions and private philanthropy made all previous periods of beneficence seem puny. Furthermore the public showed such a lively interest in improving professorial salaries that state institutions, like privately endowed universities and colleges, added to their faculties and advanced salaries rapidly.

It was at this same period that "research" became a watchword. The miracles of medicine and applied science, the startling suggestions of Einstein and other mathematicians and physicists, the vogue for economic predictions—all these came to a great climax and absorbed public interest. No institution was longer regarded as respectable unless research was a significant part of its program. Industry caught the fever and poured out millions annually, establishing projects, institutes, and research foundations.

All these factors combined to make for great mobility in the teaching profession. The problem was not so much how an individual should find a job but of a choice among those available. Institutions were harassed to fill the places of those drained off by industry and by other institutions. Tenure was readily granted in order to make posts attractive but was held rather lightly by young scholars who expected to move to better posts.

The aftermath of 1929 had its first effect upon industry. Industrial enterprises rapidly demobilized immature research organizations. They had not produced the expected miracles; merely enlarging them had not brought commensurate improvements in products or the anticipated multiplication in number. Financial stringency and disillusionment combined to throw on the market scientists, economists, and statisticians in considerable numbers. These then sought to return to teaching.

This rush back to teaching occurred at the same moment that graduates who had no economic opportunity decided to go to graduate school to be ready when prosperity returned. Institutions, likewise, had entered upon graduate instruction when the pressure was greatest and now encouraged it for the revenue it provided during lean years.

The combined effect was an oversupply of degree holders as great as the excess of openings had been only a few years earlier. Budgets of state institutions were cut, income from endowments fell, enrollments no longer mounted rapidly and salaries were cut. Public faith reacted violently. Technological unemployment became a catch phrase; there was talk of a scientific holiday; education was put under severe criticism from within and without. Naturally these factors united to produce widespread academic unemployment.

The effect upon tenure would not have been so marked if public morale had remained firm. But superabundance of optimism was followed by public pessimism of the deepest dye. It went to extremes as foolish as optimism had previously. Experience was regarded as a poor guide. Economic and political nostrums became both more irresponsible and more potent. "Social security" became a slogan that evolved into a program. Political and economic issues became passionate, so that quarrels about freedom were more frequent and tenure was sought as a protection. The coming of refugees who could be employed at bargain prices by hard-pressed institutions threatened the posts of some teachers. Earnest seekers for jobs, who made no salary demands, gave administrative officers an opportunity to displace some of those members of the faculty who had been accepted when trained people were scarce and salaries relatively high, but who had not proved equal to their tasks. There were efforts to economize in unwise ways, or to use pretended economy as a stalking horse for callousness or tyranny. All these things combined with the rising sense of panic to increase the pressure for "security" through tenure, just when shrinking income made institutions hesitate to accept long-term commitments of any kind.

Only an atmosphere bordering upon hysteria could possibly have furnished the setting for some of the things we have witnessed. Relatively minor episodes have been the occasion for severe breaks in academic morale. Full-dress investigations have reviewed the procedures of individual institutions with particular care to keep no domestic laundry for the private daily rinse. Associations have bid for members on the promise of fighting for quick tenure. Two results have been exceedingly bad. The first, and by far the

most important, has been the serious impairment of morale in many institutions. A reign of terror is not a good atmosphere in which to conduct an educational program. The second has been to make administrative officers even more conspicuously wanting in courage than before. There is a profound temptation to accept poor teaching rather than run the risk of an uproar if the teacher is displaced. Actions tend to be overcautious and then rash—the typical unevenness of a nervous and excited person.

VII

The great pressure for rapid acquisition of tenure is a self-defeating move. If the period of probation is long, department chairmen, deans, and presidents are prone to give the beginner the benefit of the doubt, hoping that with experience and maturity he may improve. Indeed, so prone are they to what from one point of view may be described as patience and from another as indecision that many an incompetent has acquired an equity in his job by adverse possession. Frequently the personal sympathies were too great during the protracted depression, when officials hesitated to turn into unemployment a teacher who, in their opinion, should not be kept "permanently." For a time they were as optimistic as the business community that prosperity would turn the corner and separation would then be easy. But as the years went on the problem became more difficult.

On the other hand, if the period of probation is too short officials are forced to a decision. Hating to make a decision that involves a long-term commitment, they give the institution rather than the teacher the benefit of the doubt and refuse the appointment that carries premature tenure. Into this course of action they are encouraged also by the fact that any vacancy is certain to have many applicants, and reasonable industry and luck assure at least as good a man as the one under immediate review. Moreover, in a short probation he will not have established ties of property or of personal acquaintance which make separation difficult for college officers to contemplate. Their sense of responsibility on that point mounts rapidly if given time to mature.

The moment at which the teacher should acquire tenure is a

matter of practical judgment. Any attempt to establish a theory which fixes an optimum period for probation is certain to fail. Rules, therefore, rest upon empirical bases, not upon any inherent validity. Each teacher should be given tenure whenever it is clear that he is a success. The grant of tenure does not fix him in the post. He is always free to leave and may even be encouraged to do so. But it is a wholly different thing to advise a man to leave if you have deprived yourself of the authority to dismiss him. The difference is not merely one of power; there is an important psychological difference also. He can leave with better grace, and other institutions are vastly less suspicious of his availability. A man may be a success and entitled to this recognition, even though the road to advancement is closed by too many senior departmental colleagues, by restricted institutional funds—or for many other reasons.

The habits of our speech often betray our thoughts. When we speak of a problem we always think of a solution. But “problems” of the dimensions of academic freedom and tenure do not have neat, simple, and final “solutions.” Rather they must be in perpetual process of solution, and they assume fresh forms as we reach new stages. The aspects of tenure which make it at the moment a peculiarly acute issue will pass. In time the number of candidates and the number of openings will come again into some rough kind of balance. Or it may be that there will again be a surplus of openings. When and if either of those stages arrives the issue of tenure will decline in momentary importance. But as long as men seek freedom, the problem of protecting academic freedom will remain; and as long as that problem remains, tenure will be one of its symbols.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

EDITORIAL NOTE: On May 5 and 6, 1941 a conference called by the American Council on Education to consider the possible extension of Social Security coverage to faculty members and staffs of institutions of higher education was held at the Lafayette Hotel in Washington, D. C. On May 14, 1941 Dr. George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education, sent a memorandum of this conference "To the Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions." In his transmittal letter, Dr. Zook said: "We sincerely hope that you will give this matter your thoughtful consideration and that you will cooperate in the attempt which will be made to secure the reactions of higher institutions to further extensions of the Social Security Act."

Early in the fall, a Chapter Letter will be sent to all chapter officers of the American Association of University Professors requesting chapter consideration of the issues presented in Dr. Zook's memorandum. In the meantime, it is hoped that the subject of this memorandum, which is of vital concern to all college and university teachers, will receive careful consideration by the entire membership of the Association. In this connection, the article "Higher Educational Institutions and the Social Security Act" on pages 358-374 should be helpful to an understanding of the subject.

Dr. Zook's memorandum and the statement by the Committee on Insurance and Annuities of the Association of American Colleges, which was enclosed with it, are printed below.

I. Introduction

The proposal to extend coverage under the federal Social Security plan to faculty members and nonprofessional staffs of institutions of higher education continues to receive increasing attention. As is probably known to many administrators, the Association of American Colleges has considered these matters at its annual conventions in recent years and has endorsed the principle of coverage to staff members under Title II, Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, but the Association has consistently expressed opposition to inclu-

sion under the unemployment compensation section of the Act. Enclosed is a copy of their recent statement.¹

Upon the suggestion of several constituent member organizations and following the action of an informal committee which considered these problems in February, the American Council on Education called together in Washington on May 5-6 a conference of the representatives of a number of associations representing institutions of higher education and teachers together with officers of the Social Security Board. At this meeting there was an informal but extended discussion with respect to the problems of coverage under the Act. While there was no final action upon the most satisfactory manner to accomplish the objectives in mind, it was evident that there was a question in the minds of some of the representatives concerning the desirability of coverage under the federal plan and the methods of coverage.²

II. Reasons for Reconsideration of Exemptions

When the original Social Security Act of 1935 was passed Congress exempted the employees of the nonprofit, charitable, educational, and religious organizations, and the employees of state and local governments from coverage of the Act, together with certain other groups of workers. This action was influenced in part by educational administrators. Six years have intervened since the passage of the law and it now appears desirable to reconsider this earlier decision. The Social Security Board together with the Advisory Committee on Social Security and the President have recommended the elimination of this exemption. Evidence of increasing consideration of the problem is the fact that there were introduced in the last Congressional session no less than eight specific bills to modify this exemption. In the present session several bills have been introduced and others are reported under consideration. Plans are now being formulated for hearings before the appropriate committees.

¹ See pp. 352-357.

² One point presented by some of the participants in the conference was the possible danger to educational institutions which may be involved in further extension of the influence of the Federal Government into educational matters.

—The Editor

Some of the factors which indicate the necessity of re-examining the proposal with respect to exemption are as follows: (1) increasing comprehension of problems of old-age retirement protection; (2) liberalization of benefit payments under the 1939 Amendment to include payment to widows and dependent children; (3) extension through institutional initiative of programs to provide for old-age protection of professional and nonprofessional staffs; (4) desirability of maintaining adequate continued protection for staff members who move from occupations which are covered by the Act to those occupations which are not included; and (5) possible inclusion under old-age and survivors insurance without inclusion under unemployment compensation.

III. Problems Considered by the Conference

The conference devoted considerable attention to several problems which would arise in the event of coverage under the federal Social Security plan as follows:

A. Old-Age and Survivors Insurance:

1. What would be the required institutional budget adjustments necessary to meet additional costs for old-age and survivors insurance? It was pointed out that for a considerable number of institutions such costs would not be excessive since many of these institutions already have plans providing for old-age protection for their staffs.

2. In the case of the public institutions what steps are necessary to permit the federal government to tax state and local governmental units for their share of the payroll taxes?

3. In order to avoid the constitutional question of intergovernmental immunity, what are the merits and weaknesses of the use of voluntary compacts for this purpose?

4. Does the present provision of a Federal Old-Age Trust Fund for contributions obviate the objection relative to the taxation of privately controlled institutions?

5. Can constitutional amendments, statutes, and charters be secured to reorganize and coordinate existing pension plans with the federal "floor of protection?"

B. Unemployment Compensation:

In order to provide more adequate information with respect to unemployment compensation coverage the committee requested

the American Council to make, or to cause to be made, a study of the incidence of unemployment among faculty and nonprofessional staffs of higher institutions during recent years, together with probable costs of coming under this title of the Act, and the anticipated benefits which would accrue to the higher institutions and their staffs.

IV. Survey of Opinion

The conference recommended that associations made up of institutions of higher education canvass their members to obtain more complete information regarding such questions as:

1. Should the present exemptions be continued?
2. Should the Act be amended to include coverage under the unemployment compensation?
3. Should the Act be amended to include coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance provision?
4. If old-age and survivors insurance is extended should it include privately controlled institutions? Publicly controlled institutions? Faculty members only? Nonprofessional staffs?
5. Should those persons now under institutional, state, or other systems of old-age insurance be exempted?

V. Associations and Representatives at Conference on May 5 and 6, 1941

American Association of Junior Colleges: Walter C. Eells, executive secretary

American Association of Teachers Colleges: Uel W. Lamkin

American Association of University Professors: Ralph E. Himstead, general secretary, and William M. Hepburn, associate secretary

American Association of University Women: Mrs. Anne Page

American Federation of Labor: Miss Elizabeth Pascal

American Federation of Teachers: Miss Selma Borchardt, legislative representative

Association of American Colleges: Guy E. Snavely, executive director, and William E. Weld, chairman, Committee on Insurance and Annuities

Association of American Universities: Richard C. Tolman

Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities: C. W. Creel,
assistant secretary

Association of Urban Universities: H. E. Simmons

Central Association of University and College Business Officers:
William B. Harrell

National Association of State Universities: Herman G. James,
secretary-treasurer

National Education Association: Mrs. Madaline K. Remmlein

Social Security Board: George E. Bigge, member, Social Security Board; Wilbur J. Cohen, technical advisor to the Board; John J. Corson, director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; Merrill G. Murray, assistant director of Bureau; John B. St. John, chief actuary of Bureau; Lyle Schmitter, chief, Financial Section of Bureau of Research and Statistics; Morton Stavis, attorney, Federal Security Agency; and W. R. Williamson, actuarial consultant

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association: Rainard B. Robins, vice-president

*Committee on Insurance and Annuities of the Association of
American Colleges¹*

*Amendments to Social Security Act of Interest to Colleges and
Universities*

The original old-age benefits sections of the Social Security Act, effective January 1, 1937, provided benefits for covered workers upon retirement after attaining age 65, these to begin January 1, 1942. These benefits, related to total compensation during covered employment, were to be quite modest for those retiring in 1942, but, in years to come, might reach \$85 a month. Annuities were to be paid to retired workers only and were to be the same for bachelors as for married persons. Contributions required of workers and their employers were calculated to be sufficient in total to support anticipated outlays, but benefits for those retiring soon, small as they were, would have been many times as large as corresponding contributions could purchase.

¹ Reprinted from May, 1940 *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges*.

Effective January 1, 1940, these provisions of the Social Security Act were amended fundamentally and the changes will be of interest to colleges and universities even though employment for these institutions continues to be excepted from the operation of the Act. They include the following:

(a) Old-age benefits begin this year instead of in 1942 as originally planned;

(b) For those retiring soon benefits will be larger than was contemplated in the earlier Act, while for a single person retiring many years hence the benefits will be smaller than was originally contemplated;

(c) Wives', widows' and orphans' benefits were introduced;

(d) The original Act provided for an increase in the rate of special wage taxes levied against employers and employees from 1% to 1½% on January 1, 1940; under the amended Act this increase will not be made;

(e) There is no longer any expectation that the plan shall be self-supporting; contributions of employers and employees—in the form of wage taxes as formerly—are expected to cover about two-thirds of the cost of benefits, the remainder to come from general taxation;

(f) These wage taxes are levied through the "Federal Insurance Contributions Act," and Section 201 (a) of the Social Security Act now provides that "There is hereby appropriated to the Trust Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equivalent to 100 per centum of the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to the taxes) received under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and covered into the Treasury." It is from the Trust Fund here mentioned that payment of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits is to be made.

All of these changes emphasize the objective of meeting social needs, with less attention than formerly to individual equity. A married pensioner receives the same benefit as does a widower or a bachelor with the same compensation history, but a wife past age 65 receives half as much as does her husband and if she survives him she then receives three-fourths of his pension. If an insured bachelor dies before reaching age 65 and leaves no dependents, the death benefit is very small; but if a person with the same compensation history left a wife and one or more dependent chil-

dren, they would receive substantial benefits, the total of which would depend on the number of children.

A few examples may be helpful:

Example 1. A person now age 65 who has worked in industry at \$100 a month since January 1, 1937 may retire now and receive \$25.75 a month for life. If he is married to a woman of age 65 or more, she will receive \$12.87 a month, and, after her husband's death, if she should outlive him, she will receive \$19.30 a month for the remainder of life. This man paid a total of \$36 in wage taxes during the years 1937-1939 and his employer paid a like amount on his behalf.

Example 2. A mechanic now age 30 with a wife and three children has had steady employment in industry since 1937 at \$100 a month. If he should die, his wife would receive for herself and her children \$51.50 a month until the eldest child reached 16, or 18 if in school; then the benefit would be diminished somewhat, but until the youngest child reached age 16, or 18 if in school, the benefit would be \$32.19 a month. After the youngest child reached age 18, benefit payments would be suspended entirely, to be resumed when the widow reached age 65. (The widow's benefit ceases upon remarriage.)

Example 3. Suppose a mechanic aged 55 in January, 1940 has, since January 1, 1937, been working for a college that has no retirement plan for its service staff. Shall he be encouraged to stay with the college if he has an opportunity to go into industrial employment? If he should earn \$1500 a year in industry for the next ten years, he would pay \$292.50 in wage taxes and could then retire and receive a little more than \$27 a month for the remainder of his life; if he is married to a woman of his own age, she will receive \$13.50 during his life after she attains age 65, and if she survives him, she will receive as a widow \$20.25 a month for the remainder of her life.

Example 4. Consider an employee now age 60 in a college maintenance staff and receiving \$100 a month and suppose that college employment were covered by the old-age and survivors' insurance plan beginning January 1, 1941. During the following four years this man would contribute in all 6% of his compensation, and the college would do likewise, making a total of \$144 in taxes paid on his behalf. At the end of that time he would be entitled to \$20.80 a month for life and if he should have a wife past age 65, she would receive \$10.40 a month for life, this to be increased to \$15.60 a month at her husband's death if she should survive him.

If the college should undertake to furnish some such benefit—

even for the retired workers alone—it would cost something like \$2500 instead of \$144, the total of taxes mentioned above.

Example 5. Again consider a worker aged 35 with a wife and two children and receiving \$100 a month. If coverage were extended to colleges on January 1, 1941 and this man should die on July 1, 1942 after having paid \$18 in wage taxes, his widow and children would together receive about \$19.40 a month until the children were 16 or 18 years old. If death occurred on January 1, 1945, the total benefit would be \$36.40 a month. In fact, if this individual had been employed in industry from January 1, 1937 at the same wage, the benefit to the widow and children in July, 1942 would have been \$46.16 a month.

Not many months will pass in most college communities before someone in industrial employment will die, leaving dependents who will receive benefits ranging from \$20 to \$60 a month, and college staff members will then become conscious of what it means to be covered by the Social Security Act. When an employee in college service dies, whether in academic or non-academic work, his widow may point out that her husband had nothing to say about whether or not college employment should be covered by this plan and may suggest that she has at least a moral claim against the college for benefits equivalent to those that would have been forthcoming had colleges been covered.

The examples given above show how benefits vary with need. It is difficult to operate such a plan on a commercial basis, and dangerous, if not impracticable, for a college or university to undertake such a scheme alone. A college could, of course, assure faculty members and maintenance employees that it would make the same payments to them and their dependents that would be forthcoming if they were covered by the Social Security Act, but it would be ill-advised to do so. But even this would not meet the problem because anyone who left the college for covered employment would find both his old-age and his survivors' benefits substantially lower, if existent, than they would have been had he served in industry alone. The shifting of employees from one employer to another has much to do with the need of a national basis for social benefits. The shifting of employees from covered to uncovered employment, and *vice versa*, introduces almost insur-

mountable difficulties if social need is to be the basis of benefit payments.

The social security plan is not expected to be self-supporting, so that those not covered will help to pay the benefits of those who are. Participation is required of covered classes but is not even available to others. Hardship is in store for many who have only the choice between unemployment and uncovered employment after having participated in the plan, and widows and orphans will frequently be the losers. This prospect will be substantially reduced when coverage of the Act is more nearly complete.

It will be difficult to defend substantial benefits to those who retire from covered employment in the next few years after having paid very little in taxes, at the same time that other workers—just as deserving and just as much in need—receive nothing, merely because, through no choice of theirs, they have had no right to participate in the plan. Widows and orphans of men who served in uncovered employment may be pathetic examples of how a national social security plan should not work, especially if it must be admitted that those families helped indirectly to pay benefits for those in covered employment.

The remedy is to extend coverage as rapidly as is practicable with the objective of finally making it universal. The attitude of Washington is to recommend extensions whenever they seem practicable but to move as slowly as is necessary to avoid opposition.

Position of Colleges

Colleges and non-profit organizations of several other types originally opposed coverage under a national benefit plan which:

- (1) Provided annuities to retired workers, and little else;
- (2) Was presumably to be supported by special wage taxes of covered employments;
- (3) Calculated benefits in such a way that they were additive in a very favorable manner to whatever benefits might be provided for uncovered service.

Today the colleges face the question of whether or not they should be covered by a national benefit plan which:

- (a) Provides benefits for survivors and dependents as well as for covered workers themselves;

- (b) Is admittedly not self-supporting;
- (c) Calculates benefits in a way that is not additive in a satisfactory manner to whatever benefits may be provided for uncovered service;
- (d) Offers benefits determined in accordance with presumptive need rather than in accordance with individual equity that might be measured by wage taxes; and
- (e) Cannot be satisfactorily duplicated through the cooperation of a life insurance company.

The section of the Internal Revenue Code that levies wage taxes on employees covered by the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions and their employers makes no mention of the purpose of these taxes but, as already stated, the present act appropriates 100% of such taxes for 1940 and future years to the Trust Fund from which these benefits are to be paid. While these revenues are doubtless properly labeled "taxes," this provision for appropriation has the effect of fixing their purpose as definitely as if they had been called contributions to a retirement fund. As in other countries that have established social benefits on a national scale, the special taxes are admittedly not sufficient to support the benefits.

There is little evidence that college officials have heretofore given thought to whether or not staff members desired this coverage. In fact, it seems probable that most staff members have no well-defined opinions on this subject, but there is reason to believe that this condition will change rapidly in the future. Both academic and non-academic staff members of colleges and universities and their families will soon learn from friends and relatives of the survivors' benefits available in industry but not available for college employment.

It therefore behooves college officials in their own interest to learn in detail what is here involved so that whatever position they may take will be a reasoned one.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT¹

By MERRILL G. MURRAY and ILSE M. SMITH²

Large numbers of employees in institutions of higher education are today without definite protection against dependency due to old age. There are approximately 1120 such institutions which, as far as could be ascertained, do not have formal retirement plans providing benefits in event of old age, death, or disability; this group employs some 43 per cent of the total professional staff in institutions of higher education.³ Within some 580 institutions which have formal plans, a fourth or more of all employees, both professional and non-professional, may possibly remain outside the scope of the plan. It seems likely, therefore, that a considerable proportion of the professional staff and a larger proportion of all non-academic employees of these institutions lack systematic provisions for retirement.

Members of formal retirement plans, moreover, may desire the additional protection afforded by the Social Security Act. The Social Security Board has found that a much greater number of workers move in and out of covered employments than was anticipated at the time the act was passed.⁴ It is likely that many

¹ Reprinted from *Social Security Bulletin*, Vol. 3, No. 12, December, 1940.

² Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. This article is based on data compiled for an address presented before the Association of University and College Business Officers at Ann Arbor, May 15, 1939, by Mr. Murray, Assistant Director of the Bureau, in charge of the Analysis Division. The discussion has been brought up to date as far as possible, from sources of information at hand and recent publications.

³ Includes colleges and universities, professional schools, teachers colleges, normal schools, junior colleges, and Negro colleges. The data on the number of institutions having plans and the proportion of professional staff members affected were estimated by the Office of the Actuary, Social Security Board, from information provided by U. S. Office of Education and other agencies. These data represent approximations which may be refined upon detailed study of the several types of plans operating within separate institutions and the number of employees making up the professional staff.

⁴ About 5.6 million persons worked in covered employment in 1937 but not in
(Footnote continued on page 359)

of the persons now employed by higher institutions will spend part of their working life in other occupations. They may also accumulate Federal old-age insurance credits through intermittent employment—during the summer, after hours, or on week ends—in private schools operated for profit. If employment in both public and private schools could be covered by some comprehensive plan, a more rational program of old-age protection would result for such individuals.

Accordingly, when reporting to President Roosevelt on December 30, 1938, the Social Security Board recommended, among many other proposals, that non-profit educational institutions be included under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.¹ Even before the Board made its recommendations to the President and the Congress, an amendment (H. R. 101) was introduced in the House on January 3, 1939, by Representative Caroline O'Day, to remove from title VIII (now part of the Internal Revenue Code) and title II those sections that exclude from coverage certain types of non-profit organizations. The House Ways and Means Committee, to whom the bill was referred, subsequently decided not to recommend any immediate action for extension of coverage to employment in non-profit institutions. With respect to the exclusion of employment by States and their political subdivisions, the Board declared in its report that a number of State and municipal officials had indicated a desire for coverage, but the Board felt that further study was necessary of the constitutional and actuarial problems involved. No legislative action was taken.

The Social Security Board has continued to assemble data on these and other excepted employments, in order that future proposals or action toward extending coverage may be based upon adequate knowledge of the current situation. This article summarizes information now available.

1938 and about 4 million persons in 1938 but not in 1937. Thus, in the 2-year period, almost 10 million persons, or about 27 per cent of the total 36.8 million who worked in covered employment at some time during 1937 and 1938, moved in and out of such employment.

¹ Social Security Board, *Proposed Changes in the Social Security Act. A Report of the Social Security Board to the President and to the Congress of the United States*, January, 1939, pp. 9-10.

Several bills were introduced in 1940 to extend coverage to non-profit institutions, in general. These bills were: H. R. 8118 (O'Day, January 24); S. 3579 (Walsh, March 14); S. 4269 (Wagner, August 14), and H. R. 10384 (McCormack, August 20). The Walsh bill would confine the proposed extension to coverage under old-age and survivors insurance only, and would not attempt to extend unemployment compensation to non-profit institutions. The Wagner and McCormack bills would remove the exclusion of State and local governmental employment from old-age and survivors insurance coverage. A subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee has been created to study provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, and other bills or proposals on this general subject.

Institutions in the Field of Higher Education

Approximately how many higher educational institutions are now in operation? Differences are apparent among classifications of educational institutions according to whether or not certain schools were counted as institutions of higher education. This article uses the classification provided by the United States Office of Education. It is reported that in 1939 there were 1700 institutions of higher learning.¹ The geographic distribution of these institutions, which include colleges and universities, professional schools, teachers colleges, normal schools, junior colleges, and Negro colleges, is shown in Table 1. A little less than one-third of these were under Federal, State, district, or city control; more than two-thirds were under private, including denominational, control (Table 2).

The only reasonably complete data on employment in higher institutions relate to personnel employed in a professional capacity. During the academic year 1938-39, it is estimated, the professional staffs of the 1700 institutions numbered approximately 130,000.² These include administrative officers, teachers (rank of instructor and above), extension and research workers, and other

¹ U. S. Office of Education, *Educational Directory*, 1940. Bulletin 1940, No. 1, pt. III, p. 7.

² Estimated on basis of data compiled by U. S. Office of Education. Data given in terms of full-time employees.

groups of professional employees. This figure does not include the clerical and maintenance employees counted among the non-professional staff members in subsequent paragraphs. Public institu-

TABLE 1—NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND BY STATE

State or Territory	Total	Colleges and Universities	Professional Schools	Teachers Colleges	Normal Schools	Junior Colleges	Negro Institutions
Total.....	1699	673	256	169	58	435	108
Alabama.....	27	9	2	4	1	3	8
Arizona.....	5	1	..	2	..	2	..
Arkansas.....	25	9	2	2	..	7	5
California.....	103	25	21	7	..	50	..
Colorado.....	17	6	4	3	..	4	..
Connecticut.....	27	7	5	5	2	8	..
Delaware.....	3	1	1	1
District of Columbia..	26	9	5	1	2	7	2
Florida.....	14	7	3	4
Georgia.....	46	14	5	1	..	15	11
Idaho.....	8	3	2	3	..
Illinois.....	99	35	33	9	3	19	..
Indiana.....	41	22	10	4	1	4	..
Iowa.....	64	24	3	1	..	36	1
Kansas.....	44	19	1	2	..	21	2
Kentucky.....	40	11	6	5	..	16	2
Louisiana.....	22	10	..	1	5	5	5
Maine.....	15	6	1	1	5	2	..
Maryland.....	31	14	6	3	..	4	4
Massachusetts.....	68	27	13	12	6	10	..
Michigan.....	40	19	6	5	..	10	..
Minnesota.....	36	15	5	6	2	8	..
Mississippi.....	34	8	..	2	..	21	6
Missouri.....	55	14	11	7	..	18	2
Montana.....	10	4	1	2	1	2	..
Nebraska.....	24	12	3	4	1	4	..
Nevada.....	1
New Hampshire.....	8	4	..	2
New Jersey.....	34	11	9	7	..	7	..
New Mexico.....	7	2	1	2	..	2	..
New York.....	102	47	30	3	16	6	..
North Carolina.....	53	18	..	4	1	19	11
North Dakota.....	11	4	..	5	..	2	..
Ohio.....	66	46	14	2	..	3	1
Oklahoma.....	36	10	1	6	..	18	1
Oregon.....	20	10	2	..	5	3	..
Pennsylvania.....	97	50	25	13	..	7	2
Rhode Island.....	6	3	2	1
South Carolina.....	33	15	3	3	12
South Dakota.....	16	7	1	1	3	4	..
Tennessee.....	47	22	4	4	1	8	8
Texas.....	86	25	6	7	..	36	12
Utah.....	9	4	1	4	..
Vermont.....	10	6	3	1	..
Virginia.....	43	14	6	4	..	12	7
Washington.....	22	10	..	4	..	8	..
West Virginia.....	20	9	..	5	..	3	3
Wisconsin.....	34	14	5	10	1	4	..
Wyoming.....	1	1
Alaska.....	1	1
Canal Zone.....	1	1	..
Hawaii.....	1	1
Philippine Islands....	8	6	1	..	1
Puerto Rico.....	2	1	1

Source: U. S. Office of Education, *Educational Directory, 1940*, Bulletin 1940, No. 1, pt. III, p. 6.

tions probably employed about 47 per cent of these 130,000 staff members; private institutions, about 53 per cent.¹

There is little information available for any year, in either published or unpublished form, to indicate other than roughly the number of non-professional staff members (clerks, maintenance workers, custodians, and administrative employees not in executive positions) or the proportion which this group forms of the entire staff in the various institutions. Tentatively, it may be estimated that these non-professional employees represent slightly less than 30 per cent of the total staff in all higher institutions, public and private, taken as a group. In public institutions, non-professional employees probably represent about one-fourth the total employees; in private institutions, however, the proportion is well over one-third.²

Data are also incomplete with regard to the total number of staff members. In the 1700 institutions, the 1938-39 total for both professional and non-professional staff was probably about 185,000.

Women constituted 23.8 per cent of the professional staff in universities, colleges, and professional schools (excluding teachers colleges, normal schools, and junior colleges) in 1937-38. On the staffs of teachers colleges and normal schools, women outnumber the men by 33 per cent. They represent 52 per cent of the professional staff in the non-degree-granting institutions (normal schools and junior colleges).³

Legal Considerations

Extension of coverage to higher educational organizations cannot be considered fully without first recognizing the possible legal obstacles to such inclusion. Principles of constitutional law have been applied to exempt from Federal taxation salaries or wages received from State governments and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities. Recent decisions have upheld the power of the Federal Government to levy a non-discriminatory tax upon

¹ Estimate based on Table 1 in advance summary of "Statistics of Higher Education, 1937-38," released June, 1940, by U. S. Office of Education.

² Based on 1937-38 data collected by U. S. Office of Education and analyzed by National Income Division, Department of Commerce.

³ See footnote 1 above.

income derived from employment by a State-owned corporation which does not discharge a function essential to the continued existence of the State government.¹ Although the doctrines of intergovernmental immunity from taxation are undergoing a process of limitation, it is as yet unsettled or undecided whether governments (or governmental agencies or instrumentalities) are subject to direct tax as employers. If the exception of non-profit educa-

TABLE 2—INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, BY TYPE AND BY LEGAL CONTROL

Type of Institution	Total	Public Control		Private Control		
		State	District or City	Non-denominational	Protestant	Roman Catholic
Total.....	1699	354	202	453	484	206
White, total.....	1591	323	196	439	428	205
Colleges or universities.....	673	96	13	170	255	139
Professional schools.....	256	18 ¹	1	153	65	19
Teachers colleges.....	169	147	5	12	1	4
Normal schools.....	58	30	5	16	3	4
Junior colleges.....	435	32	172	88	104	39
Negro, total.....	108	31	6	14	56	1
Colleges or universities.....	61	15	2	6	37	1
Professional schools.....	7	1	...	4	2	...
Teachers colleges.....	12	9	3
Normal schools.....	4	1	3	...
Junior colleges.....	24	6	1	3	14	...

¹ Includes 3 under Federal control.

Source: U. S. Office of Education, *Educational Directory, 1940*, Bulletin 1940, No. 1, pt. III, p. 7.

¹ *Helvering v. Gerhardt*, 304 U. S. 405; decided May 23, 1938. See also: *Graves et al. v. N. Y. ex rel. O'Keefe*, 306 U. S. 466; decided Mar. 27, 1939; U. S. Dept. of Justice, *Taxation of Government Bondholders and Employees: The Immunity Rule and the Sixteenth Amendment*, 1939, pp. vi, 9-10; and Fuller, Edgar, "Federal Taxation of Public School Activities," American Council on Education, *Eighth Yearbook of School Law, 1940*, pp. 152-156. [EDITOR'S NOTE. In this connection, it should be noted that the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939 made the compensation of teachers in state colleges and universities taxable as income, effective with the 1939 Federal Income Tax returns. See "Federal Income Tax Returns in 1941," February, 1941 *Bulletin*, American Association of University Professors, pp. 76-81.]

tional organizations were eliminated by amendment, difficulties would still be presented by proposed coverage for public educational institutions.

The Board has studies in progress on possible methods of extending the provisions of old-age and survivors insurance to public employees, including educational employees. The simplest method, if legally possible, would be compulsory coverage. Alternative plans under consideration include the use of voluntary compacts between the Federal Government and individual States or even with political subdivisions.

Extension of coverage to employees of private institutions is complicated by the fact that Federal revenue acts customarily exempt from Federal taxation those non-profit organizations which are operated chiefly for educational, religious, and other purposes, as specified. Fear has been expressed that extension of social security taxes to them would set a precedent for taxation for other purposes in the future. Establishment of such a precedent seems unlikely, however, especially since Congress in 1939 adopted the recommendations of the Advisory Council and the Secretary of the Treasury in transforming the old-age reserve account into a trust fund under a board of trustees, and in providing that taxes received under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and covered into the Treasury shall be automatically appropriated to the trust fund. The Walsh bill would provide a further guarantee by requiring that taxes collected from groups to which the bill would extend coverage should be paid directly into this trust fund, without being previously covered into the Treasury. Non-profit organizations are already required to assist their employees in the event of injury on the job, through payments to State workmen's compensation funds, a requirement which may be considered a form of taxation for special social purposes.

Coordination with Existing Retirement Plans

The effect upon present retirement systems for college and university staff members is perhaps the most important consideration in contemplating coverage of such institutions by Federal old-age and survivors insurance. The prior existence of these systems

constituted an important reason next to the legal barriers, for the initial exclusion of educational institutions.

This article does not attempt to outline the features of the various systems. Their general characteristics have already been described in a survey by the Office of Education in 1937,¹ and in two studies by Rainard B. Robbins.² The recently published study by Robbins outlines the present status and evolution of college plans, describes briefly selected plans, and tabulates variations among plans at institutions using contracts of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.³ Payments may be made under group-annuity contracts with commercial insurance companies, or under the various arrangements possible with the T. I. A. A. The payments may represent retiring allowances still available to a limited group of teachers from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, or allowances under general State retirement systems and certain retirement systems for teachers. Again, they may represent pensions from funds accumulated by religious organizations, or payments under special plans administered entirely by the employing institution. In many institutions, where none or only part of the professional staff are protected by some formal plan, each person retiring may be voted a special pension. The large extent to which such informal arrangements are in effect is not always realized.

At present, about 580 institutions of higher education operate formal retirement plans.⁴ These institutions employ on the aggregate about 74,000 teachers and other professional staff members.

¹ Flanagan, Sherman E., *Insurance and Annuity Plans for College Staffs*, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1937, No. 5, 83 pp.

² Robbins, Rainard B., *College Plans for Retirement Income*, 1940, 253 pp., and *Retirement Plans for College Faculties*, 1934, 68 pp.

³ A non-profit corporation, operated under the supervision of the department of insurance of New York. The Association was established to issue individual deferred-annuity contracts to employees of colleges and universities, these annuities to be purchased by the combined contributions of teacher and college. Individuals may also take out their own retirement annuities, toward which the institution does not contribute, and they can also take out insurance policies with the Association.

⁴ See footnote 3, page 358. In 1940 Robbins queried 755 higher institutions (including some in Canada and Newfoundland) and found at least 337 with retirement income plans. No information could be obtained from 128 institutions, and 290 reported that there was no plan. The 755 institutions included, in general, colleges and universities (accredited schools plus some others), but not teachers colleges unless they used T. I. A. A. contracts or were covered by plans extending to other colleges and universities (and were accredited by American Association of Teachers Colleges); they also did not include junior colleges and normal schools, which institutions are among the 1700 considered in the present article.

This number represents approximately 57 per cent of the professional staff in all higher institutions, or about 66 per cent of the professional staff in 350 public institutions, 48 per cent in 230 private institutions. The number of teachers who are members of the retirement plans is somewhat lower. This differential may be partly offset by informal plans in certain of the private institutions. About 180 of these 580 institutions, which in some cases also have other retirement arrangements, participate in deferred annuities under the T. I. A. A. plan. In several hundred additional institutions, teachers deposit with this Association annual contributions toward retirement, which, however, are not supplemented by amounts from the employing institutions.

Publicly controlled institutions with formal retirement plans, numbering 350 of the 580 institutions, employ about 40,000 professional staff members. More than a fourth of these are employed by institutions which help their teachers pay premiums for deferred annuities under contracts with the T. I. A. A. Many of the others are employed by institutions in which the staff are members of State and municipal retirement systems. Some of them, however, are employed by institutions which provide retirement benefits through other means, such as group annuities from commercial insurance companies. The 230 private institutions with formal retirement plans have on their staff, it is estimated, about 34,000 professional employees. Of this number, more than half have annuities with the T. I. A. A., purchased by joint premiums paid by the individual and the institutions. The others are protected by church pension plans, by commercial group annuity contracts, special funding plans, scheduled payments by the institution out of current income, or by some other method.

General State retirement systems and some State and municipal plans for teachers apply to all persons on the pay roll. Likewise, church pension funds frequently protect all employees of affiliated institutions. Group life insurance and group health and accident insurance plans generally include both the professional and non-professional staff. The old-age retirement plans, however, were adopted primarily for faculty members and usually include administrative officers along with teachers. On the other hand, instructors are not included with the faculty of some institutions,

and administrative employees other than officers are sometimes counted as maintenance workers.

Eighty-two per cent of the institutions reporting to the Office of Education in 1937 as having such plans, provided only for the faculty. Of course, a few retirement plans have for years covered non-faculty members, and a few plans have been adopted especially for them. Robbins distinguishes three groups of staff members—teachers, administrative officers, and maintenance workers—and reports that public institutions more generally than private institutions have provided for the maintenance employees. He found that 27 institutions using T. I. A. A. contracts provide old-age income for maintenance workers; an additional 53 institutions with other plans (of which 33 were public institutions) cover this latter group. At least five private institutions without T. I. A. A. contracts have separate retirement plans for such workers. Interest in extending old-age retirement provisions to custodians, clerks, and other non-professional employees is widespread at the present time.¹

The existing retirement plans could be adjusted to make them supplementary to the Federal system. This should be the normal procedure rather than abandonment of existing plans, if coverage were extended to higher educational institutions. The Social Security Act aims to provide only basic protection to employees. Benefits are relatively larger for lower-salaried employees than for those receiving higher incomes. Earnings in excess of \$3000 are excluded from consideration. Undoubtedly, institutions would wish to continue existing plans to provide supplementary benefits for the academic staff, who would be likely to find benefits inadequate under the Federal plan. In addition, the non-professional staff, less regularly protected by existing pension provisions, would have at least the protection of Federal old-age and survivors insurance. The T. I. A. A. has pointed out that "the annuity contracts of this Association will lend themselves conveniently to whatever adjustments may be appropriate if it is desired to use

¹ Flanagan, Sherman E., *op. cit.*, p. 64; Robbins, Rainard B., *College Plans, op. cit.*, pp. 4, 6-7; and "Economic Security in Institutions of Higher Education," *Proceedings, 1939*, Vol. XI, Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 1939, p. 139.

them to supplement the provisions of an amended Social Security Act." The Association also suggests that, because of the apparent longevity of annuitants and also on account of decreasing returns on investments of institutions, extension of the act might seem to offer alleviating provisions to some institutions.¹

If past experience with private industrial pension plans is a guide, extension of the act to higher educational institutions would probably give rise to additional private plans or supplementation of such plans, rather than elimination. Very few industrial concerns have abandoned their previous retirement plans since 1935, when the Social Security Act was passed. A number of companies have rewritten their pension plans or inaugurated new ones: included among these are the International Harvester Company, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, the Western Union Telegraph Company, the Public Service Corporation of New Jersey, and the United States Steel Corporation.² In some measure, revisions in private industrial plans have consisted of providing supplementary benefits for employees with salaries of \$3000 or more, a development which, in the case of educational institutions, would safeguard the equities of higher-paid faculty members who are already members of retirement plans. Payments under such plans are not subject to social security taxes, since the 1939 amendments exclude from the definition of "wages" all payments made by an employer to or on behalf of an employee under a plan or system providing for retirement, for sickness or accident disability, or for medical and hospitalization expenses in connection with such disability. Dismissal payments and, with certain reservations, death payments are also excluded from the definition.

¹ Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, *Twentieth Annual Report to Policyholders*, 1938, pp. 29-30. In the *Twenty-first Annual Report to Policyholders*, issued as of Dec. 31, 1939, a comment on p. 3 indicates that the nature of the 1939 amendments to the act do not necessitate change in the earlier statement.

² Princeton University, *The Effect of the Social Security Act on Private Pension Plans*, 1939; also, mimeographed list of companies which have revised their pension plans or have inaugurated new plans, issued by the University May 1, 1939. For additional information see: National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., *Company Pension Plans and the Social Security Act*, Studies in Personnel Policy No. 16, 1939, 46 pp.

Administrative Problems

From the Government's standpoint, administration of old-age and survivors insurance might be simplified in some respects if coverage were extended to educational institutions. Questions have arisen as to whether certain educational institutions are non-profit organizations "no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual," within the meaning of sections 209 (b) (8) and 1607 (c) (8) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939. The necessity for specific rulings differentiating between profit-making and non-profit-making higher educational organizations would disappear if the act were extended to non-profit colleges and universities. However, in some instances, the question might still remain whether some institution, because of money received from public funds, might be considered an instrumentality of either the Federal or local government. Simultaneous extension of coverage to both private and public institutions, however, would remove this problem.

On the other hand, questions may arise as to whether certain individuals on the staffs of educational institutions are "employees" within the meaning of the act. On at least one occasion, a profit-making college covered by the act has asked the Bureau of Internal Revenue to decide whether certain instructors and substitutes were employed on a contractual basis and hence excluded from coverage, or were in the requisite employer-employee relationship for old-age insurance purposes.¹ Furthermore, as amended, the act now does not cover service performed for an organization exempt from income tax (under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code), if performed by a student enrolled and regularly attending classes at a school, college, or university, or service performed in any calendar quarter for a school, college, or university not exempt from income tax, under section 101, if performed by a student enrolled and regularly attending such school and if the remuneration does not exceed \$45, exclusive of room, board, and tuition. The continuance of such exemptions would complicate the auditing by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of tax reports from institutions of higher education.

¹ Unemployment Compensation Interpretation Service, 391-S. S. T. 341. The decision was that the individuals constituted employees.

An additional problem is created by the fact that the institutions sometimes provide remuneration in the form of rent, board, and lodging to certain employees. The value of perquisites granted in 10 Negro land-grant colleges in 1936, for example, varied from \$240 to \$1200 per year.¹ Problems involved in evaluating wages in kind are not peculiar to this employment and are already being handled successfully by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in other employment situations.

Economic Considerations

Salary data compiled for 25,530 full-time faculty members in 252 colleges and universities showed that, in 1936, typical (median) salaries for full professors hired on a 9-month or 12-month basis in public institutions, varied from \$1562 to \$3951, and from \$1662 to \$5733 in the case of full professors in private institutions (Table 3). No comprehensive report is available of changes occurring over the past 3 or 4 years in the distribution of staff members by salary.

Few institutions take the position that payment of salary relieves them of all further financial responsibility for employees. The necessity of assisting, at some time or other, individual faculty members or their families who are in financial difficulty is a present or potential charge upon college funds. Because of professional requirements and the circumstances of their employment, faculty members, like employees in other occupations, are frequently unable to prepare for financial emergencies created by illness, disablement, or death. In almost every rank, expenditures absorb practically the entire salary, allowing slight opportunity for saving.²

Protection against death, sickness, and old age was long considered the personal responsibility of the employee. Nevertheless, the institutions found that aged and disabled faculty members required some assistance, if only in the form of payments in kind;³

¹ Greenleaf, Walter J., *College Salaries, 1936*, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1937, No. 9, p. 6.

² Boothe, Viva, *Salaries and Cost of Living in Twenty-seven State Universities and Colleges, 1913-1932*, 1932, p. 122. Income and expenditures for 96 academic families in Berkeley, Calif., are reported by Jessica B. Peixotto in *Getting and Spending at the Professional Standard of Living*, 1927, 307 pp.

³ Robbins, Rainard B., *Retirement Plans, op. cit.*, pp. 65 and 67.

TABLE 3—NUMBER AND MEDIAN SALARIES OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND BY FACULTY RANK, 1935-36¹

Type of Institution	Number of Institutions	Deans		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Instructors			
		9 Months	12 Months	9 Months	12 Months	9 Months	12 Months	9 Months	12 Months	9 Months	12 Months		
Employment on basis of													
Number of faculty members													
Total.....	252	235	744	4679	3330	2260	1685	3344	2301	4211	2741		
Public: White land-grant.....	51	52	379	1879	1595	1045	831	1658	1229	2050	1215		
Negro land-grant.....	17	5	41	30	128	15	58	28	62	95	158		
State universities.....	16	70	91	724	177	425	100	559	120	649	198		
State colleges.....	15	9	32	110	134	128	62	121	143	118	90		
Private: Men's colleges.....	16	8	16	66	260	48	150	66	139	69	214		
Women's colleges.....	38	24	26	551	150	216	37	302	39	316	58		
Large universities.....	7	4	53	301	387	104	254	209	328	337	469		
Medium-sized universities.....	16	17	54	410	232	137	113	288	198	308	272		
Small colleges.....	76	46	52	608	267	142	80	113	43	269	67		
Median salary													
Public: White land-grant.....	51	\$4300	\$4859	\$3951	\$3869	\$2973	\$3017	\$2486	\$2574	\$1792	\$2012		
Negro land-grant.....	17	2062	2094	1562	1795	1208	1586	1328	1419	1193	1173		
State universities.....	16	4075	3913	3564	3281	2726	2827	2305	2463	1803	1699		
State colleges.....	15	3125	3375	2886	2797	2171	2444	1869	2082	1582	1578		
Private: Men's colleges.....	16	4083	4375	3583	4313	3000	3354	2688	2792	2052	2027		
Women's colleges.....	38	3000	4000	3150	2700	3026	2228	2512	2023	1785	1578		
Large universities.....	7	4500	6563	5143	5733	3625	3947	2944	3051	2284	2154		
Medium-sized universities.....	16	4375	5167	3950	4125	3215	3198	2673	2583	1811	1406		
Small colleges.....	76	1594	2083	1662	1879	1429	1670	1375	1478	1015	1190		

¹ Figures based on data for 25,530 full-time staff members in 252 colleges and universities. Of the 25,530 staff members, 14,729 are on 9-month basis (*i. e.*, employed for 9 months, whether or not pay checks are received) and 10,801 are on 12-month basis (*i. e.*, employed for period of 12 months, with 1 month or more for vacation).

Source: Greenleaf, Walter J., *College Salaries, 1936*, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1937, No. 9, p. 7. For scope of study and definition of terms, see pp. 1-6.

that jobs, special pensions, and gratuities were needed and sought by dependent survivors. Some data bearing on this point have been reported by the Office of Education, for a sample representing 266 higher institutions which, in 1937, had no formal plans for retirement or survivors' payments. Half these institutions paid no benefits; 18 per cent paid as much as half salary to the retiring staff member for the rest of his life; a considerable proportion paid the widow a month's full salary. In these institutions, payments were ordinarily made on the basis of individual need. Fifty-three institutions were definitely of the opinion that some form of group insurance or annuity, administered outside the institution, would be a better means of solving the problem than debating each case as it occurred. Most of the institutions without definite plans have made various attempts to solve the problem by supporting legislative proposals or obtaining the services of special agencies.¹

Under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions, workers who are now old and will soon retire will receive a considerable bonus over the actuarial equivalent of their contributions. The individual who regularly earns \$2000 a year in covered employment would be entitled to a monthly benefit if he attained age 65 after 5 years in such employment—or \$33.25. This benefit would be increased by 50 per cent if he had a dependent wife aged 65 or over, with additional amounts payable with respect to unmarried children under age 18. Thus the married man with a wife 65 or over would receive a total monthly benefit of \$49.88. Had he earned \$3000 a year instead of \$2000 a year, he himself would be eligible to receive \$42 a month, while an additional \$21 a month would be paid to his wife aged 65 or over—making a total of \$63 a month payable to the family. Under the amended Social Security Act, monthly benefits are payable not only to insured workers who retire at age 65 or later, their wives and children, but to widows, surviving children, or surviving dependent parents who qualify for benefits.

Extension of the Social Security Act to higher educational institutions would meet many present problems of colleges and universities which have no retirement plan or an inadequate plan, since a large part of the accrued burden of caring for aged staff members

¹ Flanagan, Sherman E., *op. cit.*, pp. 55-59.

would be shouldered by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program.

The colleges confront the need of providing a retirement plan for members of the non-academic staff, such as mechanics, janitors, and domestic employees. At the present time, a commercial college, a barber college, a correspondence school, and other educational, profit-making organizations are covered by the Federal act; their employees are therefore building up wage credits under the act toward retirement benefits and protection for their survivors. If the Social Security Act continues to exempt non-profit-making private and public institutions, these institutions may find it desirable to provide some system of retirement benefits for their non-academic employees which will yield benefits at least equal to those under the act. Otherwise, institutions without a satisfactory retirement plan may find it increasingly difficult to compete in the labor market for qualified employees. One college president has concluded that, "Wrestling with such problems, a constantly growing number of college executives are coming to the belief that inclusion under Federal Social Security is both necessary and inevitable."¹

Extension of the Social Security Act would also assist in meeting problems of the colleges in relation to the retirement of employees who have rendered service in many different institutions or in colleges and in non-academic pursuits. State retirement plans sometimes make special provision for transfer between public institutions within a single State. According to the various provisions of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, several alternatives are available to persons leaving active service temporarily or transferring to another institution. Most educational employees, however, would be seriously affected by frequent shifts between institutions within or without the boundaries of a single State. This situation would result from loss of employers' contributions, service credits, and interest accumulations under retirement plans; and also from ill-advised exercise of cash settlement privileges which these plans offer an employee upon separation. Extension of the Federal plan would render it less likely

¹ Stanford, Edward V., "Social Security, the Dilemma of the Colleges," *The Catholic Educational Review*, Vol. 38, No. 6 (June, 1940), p. 351.

that equities established under the institutional retirement plans would have the effect of deterring employees from making a shift for the better. In addition, the institutions might more readily add to their staff older professors of established reputation and in this and other ways might find the retirement program a more effective adjunct to the maintenance of academic standards.

At the present time many professional and other employees of institutions of higher education are without systematic protection of the types provided by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. Extension of coverage under the Social Security Act could make provision for such persons and their families and could supplement the present provision made by private retirement plans. While such an extension would entail certain legal, administrative, and financial problems, it is believed that it would also promote solution of present problems of at least equal magnitude.

COMMUNICATIONS

Inflation in the Endowed Colleges

EDITORIAL NOTE. The article "Inflation in the Endowed Colleges," published anonymously in the December, 1940 *Bulletin* of the Association, has brought more than the usual number of comments from readers of the *Bulletin*. Early in January the Editor received a letter from the President of an eastern university, enclosing a letter to the author of the article. The correspondence between the president and the author, transmitted through the Association's Washington office, is included, with a few minor revisions to maintain anonymity, among the comments printed below.

January 8, 1941

My dear Mr. Author:

I do not often write letters to the authors of articles which I have found stimulating. I do not think I have ever written one when the author was entirely unknown to me. I am asking the editor of the *Bulletin* to forward this to you, not knowing what college campus it will finally reach.

I always find the issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors stimulating. I found your article on "Inflation in the Endowed Colleges" in the December issue peculiarly so. I agree with many of the points you have made. Where we might differ is probably on figures that, for the sake of emphasis, you have omitted; you may not have actually known them.

I am deducing that the description on pages 592 and 595 applies to "A," my own college. I am guessing also, with much less evidence, that the institution described on pages 594 and 598 is "B." I am keenly interested to know what college is described on page 599. I am guessing "C," "D," or "E."

I think your final two paragraphs are extremely sound. I in-

tend to make use of them, if I may, in my forthcoming talks to our Alumni Associations.

It is possible that you may be interested in some further facts about the situation at "A." We increased the tuition with considerable hesitancy. We told every boy in college that year (and sent a letter to his parents) that no boy was to be permitted to drop out for this reason. Apparently all cases of financial need were reasonably adequately met by the increase in scholarships. In a number of cases the scholarships were increased more than the tuition increase. I received letters from two parents whose boys did not secure high enough grades to receive scholarship aid. In both cases, I secured a special award covering the amount involved in the tuition increase. That the scholarship aid awarded was reasonably adequate is further demonstrated by the fact that the amount borrowed by students from our Loan Fund, administered by a local bank, the year of the increase, was \$800 less than in the corresponding period the year before.

When we filed the budget for student income, we were quite conservative because we expected a decrease in enrollment. (This did not happen, and the student enrollment was as great as the year previous.) The budgeted student income was \$35,000 more than the actual student income, at the lower tuition fee, the preceding year. The budgeted increase in scholarship aid that year was over \$20,000 more than previously. This may prove your point or it may show that our increased income from tuition just about covered the year's deficit.

The figures on page 595 seem to apply to "A." Further details which may be pertinent are: in the period under discussion student receipts increased 126%, scholarship awards increased 113%, library expenditures 202%, size of the college 28%, size of the faculty 47%, and the total expenditure for instruction increased 45%. Furthermore, in the last five years "A's" endowment has grown slightly more than the increase in her plant.

It is quite true that an apparently disproportionate amount of money was invested in plant here from 1925-35. This disturbs us greatly. As a matter of fact, the college in 1925 was so ill-equipped that an increase in the plant was imperative if the right standard of academic work was to be maintained. Most of the

increase went into a new library, tragically needed, and new laboratories. "A's" trustees were formally opposed to any policy of over-expansion of plant at the expense of endowment. Nearly all the increase in plant came as specific gifts for this purpose. Furthermore, the Board determined to build over buildings which could be thus made satisfactory, instead of trying to secure funds for new ones. If we had tried to meet these needs with new buildings, approximately two million dollars more would have been invested in plant—if we could have secured the necessary money—than actually was, by this policy of use of existing equipment, altered.

I have gone into these details not to show that I disagree with your general point of view, but to suggest that there are sometimes reasons why a college has to put, during a given decade, a disproportionate amount of its funds into plant. This tendency here has now stopped. I, myself, do not expect to see any more new buildings on this campus.

I share some of your feeling of criticism of individualized programs, as you state on pages 596-597. However, when a college, by finding out a boy's strength or weakness, can actually help him get more out of his college course, I believe we should do it. Individualized instruction to influence a student's reading habits, and any efforts to make him emotionally more stable and physically more strong, seem to me desirable. Personally, I cannot criticize, as you do, the present tendency toward more liberalizing programs and more individual treatment of students.

One further thought occurs to me in relation to shrinkage of endowment funds: sometimes by changing investments, the annual income can be increased, even though the principal is decreased. This happened at "A" last year. We sold certain properties which were netting no income, and gained thereby in annual receipts, although we suffered a loss in the total amount of our endowment. Other colleges have done the same.

On the general question of a college's returns to its students, for tuition, you may be interested in the following which is based on figures from Circular No. 188, November, 1949, "College Income and Expenditures, 1939-40," of the U. S. Office of Education in Washington, D. C.

COLLEGE INCOME AND EXPENDITURES, 1939-40

College	I Income from Student Fees	II Income from Endowment	III Expenditure for Instruction
Amherst	\$357	\$455	\$429
Beloit	156	78	150
Bowdoin	238	300	246
Brown	730	505	735
Colgate	445	124	280
Dartmouth	972	687	1,058
Hamilton	172	157	175
Middlebury	278	131	212
Swarthmore	210	354	371
Trinity	185	144	193
Wesleyan	275	322	364
Williams	446	380	408

(,000 are omitted)

Two good tests of a college are: (1) does it receive less from its students than it invests in them from its endowment income? (Of the above colleges, this is true only of Amherst, Bowdoin, Swarthmore, and Wesleyan.) And (2), the relationship of the amount it expends for actual instruction (*i. e.*, apart from plant upkeep, etc.) to the amount it receives in fees from its students. In percentage of excess of such expenditure over student fees, the above colleges rate thus:

Percentage of Excess of Column III over Column I

College	Percentage
Swarthmore	76
Wesleyan	33
Amherst	20
Dartmouth	8.7
Trinity	4.3
Bowdoin	3.3
Hamilton	1.7
Brown	.68

Very truly,

President, ("A")

February 1, 1941

Dear President _____ :

Through the good offices of Mr. Himstead I have received your very interesting letter commenting on my article on "Inflation in

the Endowed Colleges." It was extremely good of you to write to me so fully.

You are quite right in deducing that the figures on pages 592 and 595 were drawn from reports of your college. I am much impressed by the later figures which you give. I must say I did not suppose it possible to effect sufficiently large economies in overhead to permit applying so large a part of the increase in tuition fees to scholarship aid as you have been able to do. I am still not sure, however, that higher tuition fees constitute, in the long run, a good method of financing scholarships, all other things being equal. Inevitably it will mean the appearance, at least, of expensive tuition. To safeguard the college against erroneous public notions in these days of increasing class consciousness, the number of scholarships and the total amount of money available will need to be advertised as widely as the tuition fees, and that may be difficult to do effectively. I hope I did not create an unintended impression on page 595 that there was any watering down of instruction at your college. My intention there was to indicate an intermediate case, contrasting with the "sample college," on the one hand and with the "perfect college" on the other, where instruction was *not* debased but where, to avoid it, higher tuition fees were resorted to and deficits were—I think courageously—incurred. For my figures showed your college standing higher than "F" or "G" with respect to the amounts spent per student for instruction. The figures I had worked out from the Treasurers' Reports (thank you very much for the extracts from the government bulletin, which I had not seen) showed your college spending in 1938-39, \$508.62 per student on instruction; "F," \$458.12; and "G," \$479.36. On Library also your college led with \$72.48 per student where "F" spent \$54.41, and "G" \$61.22.

There is no doubt that a good case can be made for higher tuition fees when the student receives more in instruction than he pays for. I fear there will be other increases by other institutions which do not have a similar right. I have heard the point raised that colleges with lower fees than yours will be thought by the public at large to be inferior and that the easiest way to prevent that impression—and to alleviate momentarily their financial worries—is to raise their fees too. I fear very few will have suf-

ficient self-candor to admit to themselves that they *are* inferior and set about the harder task of justifying higher fees by improved quality before announcing increases. They are more likely to put more emphasis than ever on external attractions in their competition for students. I hope, however, that I'm too pessimistic.

The problem of when to accept funds for new buildings which are really needed is certainly a very difficult one except in those rare cases when adequate endowment for upkeep is simultaneously supplied. It must bring many of the gray hairs which are the lot of college administrators. All of the new buildings at the "sample college" were useful—many of them desperately needed. But in only one case was upkeep endowment provided by the benefactors whose offers could scarcely be rejected. But that is one reason why the excellent record of 1908-09, when expenditure on instruction was 40% more than fees, has changed to the very sad proportions of expenditure of 1938-39 when only 60% of fees went into instruction and when over-head and administration used up 50% more revenue than did instruction.

I imagine we do not really disagree with respect to the value of individualized student programs or of supplying guidance. My view is that the faculty, if not overworked, can do much and do it more naturally than student problems experts. My objection to much of the "liberalizing" which has taken place is that under pressure to escape from some of the consequences of inflation it is often carried beyond sound educational values. Much of it is sheer escapism.

"C" is the "perfect college" described on page 599.

Thank you very much again for your very kind letter. I feel rather ashamed that I cannot reciprocate your candor by abandoning anonymity, but I am under obligation to the "sample college" and have been requested not to reveal its identity by disclosing my own. I must add, however, that it is not "B." "B" spends a good deal more on instruction per student than the "sample college," but its tuition charges are also a good deal higher. Student fees constitute a higher proportion of total income. The "sample college" was chosen partly because I knew a good deal about it at first hand, partly because it was a case of very marked change from the practically perfect balance for an endowed college (as

at yours still, thanks to your successful efforts to keep the situation under control)—with the student getting a great deal more instruction than his modest fees covered—to the serious unbalance of the present day.

Yours sincerely,
The Author

From the Treasurer of an eastern college for women:

Is it possible to buy a copy of the December, 1940 issue of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors? If so, I should like to procure a copy and will remit payment if you will notify me of the amount of the charge.

I have read the article entitled "Inflation in the Endowed Colleges" with considerable interest and should like to have a copy of this article in my permanent files.

From a professor in a large state university in the middle west:

The Business Manager at the University of———has just called me up to inquire whether reprints of the article entitled "Inflation in the Endowed Colleges" are available. He would like to buy 25 or 30 for the University and bring the matter to the attention of the regents. . . . We can, of course, collect from our chapter a large number of the *Bulletins* to loan to any group that would need it, but would prefer to buy reprints if possible.

Dear Editor:

I have just finished reading the thought-provoking paper "Inflation in the Endowed Colleges," on pages 591-601 of the December number. It seems to me that a great many of the criticisms apply with equal force to the state supported institutions.

The members of society as well as of the learned professions should carefully reexamine this question of electives. Regardless of who pays the bill apparently, our educational dollar should produce effective results for both society and the individual. In either case the eventual payment is by society itself.

As Mr. Carl Snyder has so ably demonstrated by statistical evidence, the growth of our civilization has paralleled our industrial growth. Our present emergency likewise demonstrates the importance of industry, a fact many of us have long recognized.

Then why allocate so much of our educational dollar for non-essentials. Your writer is correct in stating that in both cases curricula and plant have been expanded beyond our needs and in wrong directions in many instances.

I am indeed appreciative of the arts, having descended from ancestors well schooled therein. However, as an engineer and soldier I believe in the realities of life. We cannot eat our cake until we have produced it.

I commend you for publishing both the paper originally referred to and "To Think or Not to Think" which immediately precedes it. Such papers are valuable. We should have more of them.

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL D. BILLMYER

Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering
Rhode Island State College

From the April, 1941 issue of *Education Abstracts*:

Inflation in the endowed colleges. (Amer. Assoc. Univ. Profs., Dec., 1940, 26, 591-601.) The thesis presented in this article is that the fundamental cause of the current financial distress in many endowed colleges is overexpansion of functions and enrollments.

Many endowed colleges are raising their tuition rates to produce much-needed revenue. They justify their action by stating that decline in interest rates makes it necessary. In many instances it has been overexpansion of expensive plants and services and costly competition for students which have produced the enigma, and not the reduced returns on endowment. In a sample school, says the author, non-instructional expenditures increased during a given period from \$122.35 to \$245.41 per student, while instructional costs per student rose only 10 per cent. And a large part of this added cost has come from the increased expense of maintaining new buildings and expensive grounds. Impelled by a need for more revenue and a desire to prove their greatness by the measurement of numbers, colleges came to the position of soliciting students. With heavier loads, professors sought ways to lighten the strain; they "liberalized" their work, they "cut the corners."

There may be no other immediate way of escape, says the writer. But unless the endowed college changes its ways it may become a class-bound club for the well-to-do. In the past endowed colleges have enjoyed certain privileges, such as exemption from taxation. These immunities will be imperiled if the colleges

fail to maintain genuine quality or to make their facilities available at reasonable cost to all who are mentally fit to profit by them. While each college has the responsibility for saving itself, it should not use methods which may injure the future of all.

Comment: A well-written readable article which touches a vital problem. Many a college president should read it.
—Arnold E. Joyal

Correction

Professor W. A. Oldfather, author of the paper on "The Executive Committee System at the University of Illinois" which was published in the April, 1941 *Bulletin*, has requested that a correction be made in the footnote on page 195. The parenthetical statement in the third sentence of the footnote should read as follows:

(consisting actually of seven members, whose deliberations were supplemented, from time to time, by calling in for advice all the teaching staff of the rank of assistant professor and above—democracy gone quite starry-eyed)

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Regional Meetings

Athens, West Virginia

On May 3 the chapter at Concord State Teachers College was host to a regional meeting which was attended by about 50 persons principally from institutions in West Virginia, with a few representatives from schools in Ohio, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

The morning session opened at 10 o'clock with a brief statement of welcome from Dr. J. Franklin Marsh, President of Concord State Teachers College. Professor C. H. Dillon of Marshall College read a paper on "A New Source of Money for Teachers' Salaries in West Virginia." He urged the enactment of a severance tax on each ton of coal mined in West Virginia. A chief reason for such a tax was said to be absentee ownership of large amounts of West Virginia property by persons who contribute to educational institutions in other states but not in West Virginia. Another reason was said to be unsatisfactory experience with the sales tax.

Professor Frank Hall of Fairmont State Teachers College read a paper on "Tenure and Retirement for College Teachers." Professor Hall's paper was followed by a spirited discussion of the West Virginia retirement law.

Professor E. L. Lively addressed the morning session on "Some Observations in the Area of Higher Education," stressing the evil effects of pressure groups, the necessity of having skilled persons working continuously on the social and educational problems of the state, and the duty of administrative officers to consult their teachers in connection with proposed changes in educational organization and curricula.

"Ethics for College and University Teachers" was the subject of a careful analysis by Professor Roland J. Stanger of Ohio State University. Professor Stanger considered the reasons for restating the principles of professional ethics which include educa-

tional ethics. He stressed the functions of the teacher as determining factors in the ethics of the teacher.

At the afternoon session of the conference Mr. John D. Beatty, Adviser to the U. S. Office of Education in the Defense Training Program, spoke on "The Defense Rôle of Colleges and Universities." He discussed the efforts being made to create a reserve supply of trained men for admission to the lower ranks of technical labor.

Professor Oliver Martin of Ohio State University read a carefully prepared paper on "Academic Freedom: The Rights and Duties of Teachers in State Supported Colleges and Institutions." In the course of his detailed analysis of the philosophical concepts involved in his subject Professor Martin urged that the state-employed teacher has not only the right to academic freedom but the duty to act on that right.

Professor William M. Hepburn, the Associate Secretary of the Association, spoke informally on the work of the Washington office and of Committee A. He referred to specific problems which are currently of much concern to the national officers, particularly some problems which are important in connection with the present critical period and which affect the welfare of democratic institutions.

Members of the Association and guests were entertained at a reception following the afternoon session. In the evening they attended a dinner in the College dining hall, at which the speakers were Professors M. C. Cushman of Concord State Teachers College and L. G. Moffatt of the University of Virginia. Professor Cushman's subject was "Are the Colleges Responsible for Making Youth Flabby?" Professor Cushman expressed criticism of educational doctrines and standards which are in vogue in many institutions, including the theories of progressive education, emphasis on credits instead of subject matter, and administrative pressure on teachers to lower academic standards.

Professor Moffatt spoke on the subject of "Responsibility of Higher Education for the Maintenance of Democracy." In the course of his address, he stressed the point that the liberal type of education, with its mental discipline, its broad outlook which comes from contact with the sages of all times, and its humanistic

attitude toward man and the universe, best serves the democratic ideal.

Cambridge, Massachusetts

A joint meeting of members of the Association in the Boston area was held at the Faculty Club of Harvard University on March 21. There were 73 members present from the following institutions: Boston University, Brown University, Fitchburg State Teachers College, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of New Hampshire, Tufts College, Wellesley College, and Wheaton College.

Following dinner, the group was addressed by Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, his topic being "The American Association of University Professors in 1941." In his talk Dr. Himstead presented cases which illustrate the type of problem the Association is called upon to deal with. The definiteness of the situations presented proved an admirable starting point for the discussion which followed.

The meeting, the first of its kind to be held in the Boston area, has aroused much favorable comment in the institutions which were represented. The members plan to hold similar meetings annually or semi-annually.

Durham, North Carolina

A meeting of Association members from institutions in North Carolina was held on May 1 with the Duke University chapter acting as host. There were approximately 60 members in attendance, representing Duke University, Guilford College, the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, and the University of North Carolina.

The guest speaker was Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, whose topic was "The Rôle of the Association in Higher Education." Using the case method, he described the kind of work the Association is frequently requested to do and does, with special reference to academic freedom and tenure "because that aspect of the Association's work is apparently so much

misunderstood." Following his address, there were questions from the audience and informal discussion.

Manhattan, Kansas

A meeting of approximately 50 members of the Association, representing seven institutions in Kansas, was held at Kansas State College in Manhattan on April 5. This is the fifth year in which such a conference has been held by Association members in connection with the annual meeting of the Kansas Academy of Science.

Professor Frederick S. Deibler of Northwestern University, President of the Association, participated in the meeting, and gave a brief address at the morning session on the subject "The Association, Its Work and Principles." He was followed by Mr. S. A. Nock, Vice-President of Kansas State College, who discussed the relation of the college administration to the Association. Reports of chapter activities brought the morning session to a close.

In the afternoon, Professor E. H. Hollands, a charter member of the Association at the University of Kansas, spoke on the subject, "The College Professor during the First World War." At the business session, it was voted to continue a central committee composed of one representative from each chapter in Kansas. Professor A. V. Sageser of Kansas State College was elected chairman of the committee, succeeding Professor Robert Conover of the same institution who had served for four years.

New York City

On March 29 the members of the Association in and near New York City met at Hunter College for a day's conference. There was a total attendance of 118 with the following institutions represented: Brooklyn College, The City College, Columbia University, Hofstra College, Hunter College, New York University, Queens College, Rutgers University, Sarah Lawrence College, Upsala College, and Vassar College.

At the morning session, Acting President Harry N. Wright of The City College, a past president of the chapter, welcomed the visiting members. Professor Houston Peterson of Rutgers Uni-

versity served as chairman of a panel on the subject, "How Can the Colleges Meet Popular Wartime Pressures?" Participants in the panel were Professors Esther Rauschenbush of Sarah Lawrence College, Sidney Hook of New York University, and Phillips Bradley of Queens College. Discussion turned on two sets of desires: (1) to prevent forces of war diluting the academic curriculum through courses of immediate practical value, and to prevent interference with the individual's legitimate freedom of inquiry; and (2) to create trust in the critical spirit and its rights, to encourage self-discipline among faculties, and to promote collaboration with the community. The members seemed to believe that the questions now arising from the old definition of academic freedom need to be examined in terms of new forces in the world.

Following luncheon, Professor H. N. Fairchild of Hunter College introduced the afternoon speaker, Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, the General Secretary of the Association. Dr. Himstead spoke of some of the current work of the Association, citing specific problems brought to the Association and materials from cases to illustrate how the organization seeks to maintain professional standards. Dr. Himstead's speech was largely "off the record," and hence it is not reported in detail. His talk revealed the need for the Association if the principles for which it was established are to prevail.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

A regional meeting at which representatives of seven chapters in the Philadelphia area were present was held at the University of Pennsylvania Saturday, May 10. Among the chapters represented were Bryn Mawr College, Lock Haven State Teachers College, University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State College, Temple University, Villanova College, and West Chester State Teachers College. Professor Roland G. Kent, President of the University of Pennsylvania chapter, a charter member of the Association, presided at the luncheon which was addressed by two speakers. Lt. Col. John McI. Smith, Chief of the Legal Staff assigned to the headquarters for the Selective Service in Harrisburg, discussed the operation of Selective Service and how its problems were being solved in Pennsylvania. Dr. Ralph E.

Himstead, the General Secretary of the Association, spoke on the subject, "Higher Education and the Association." He presented some typical educational problems frequently brought to the Association for solution and by the use of specific case materials sought to clarify the rôle of the Association in our colleges and universities. His talk was followed by questions and discussion of various aspects of the Association's philosophy and work.

Chapter Activities

Baylor University. The chapter held its annual banquet on the evening of February 11 with a large attendance of 100 persons, including 16 members from the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Baylor University at Dallas, and Texas State College for Women. The guest speaker was Dr. Gordon G. Singleton, President of Mary Hardin-Baylor College, his topic being "The Improvement of Teaching." He indicated the importance of giving recognition to a teacher's achievements, and he also stressed the importance of faculty unity in striving toward common ideals of attainment.

Hofstra College. An open forum on "The Future I Want for Hofstra College" was held by the chapter on April 18, and was attended by 125 Association members and guests. Five persons, representing students, alumni, faculty, and trustees, appeared on the panel. Following their brief speeches, there was discussion from the floor.

Marshall College. An informal luncheon was held on May 1 by about 20 members of the chapter in honor of Professor William M. Hepburn, Associate Secretary of the Association, who was en route to a regional meeting of the Association. Dr. James E. Allen, President of the College, was also a guest of the chapter. Mr. Hepburn spoke briefly concerning the manifold work of the Washington office, illustrating his discussion with references to various cases then pending before Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

University of Minnesota. The chapter entertained Professor F. S. Deibler of Northwestern University, President of the Association, on April 6 and 7. He met informally with several members on the first evening, with others the following day at lunch, and on the evening of April 7 he spoke at an open dinner meeting which was attended by about 75 persons. Professor Deibler spoke on "The Aims and Purposes of the Association." The President of the University, the Acting President-elect, and several Deans were among the persons present at the dinner meeting.

University of New Hampshire. At a meeting of the chapter on April 24, Professor Harold H. Scudder spoke on the topic, "Why Is Proficiency in English so Lacking in Entering Students?" Denying the implication of the title, Professor Scudder outlined the new method of insuring accuracy in English, and stressed the fact that the matter was an institutional as well as a departmental responsibility. At the business meeting, the chapter voted to present to the Commencement Committee a code of procedure relative to dress and demeanor at academic ceremonies.

Occidental College. The chapter invited members of the Association at neighboring institutions in southern California to participate in a dinner meeting on March 31. Dr. Louis B. Wright of the Huntington Memorial Library presented a stimulating paper on the value of research to the teacher. The members indicated their interest in holding similar joint meetings in the future.

University of Omaha. At the chapter's second annual dinner meeting on April 25, Professor Mark H. Ingraham of the University of Wisconsin and Chairman of Committee P on Pensions and Insurance was the guest speaker. Professor Ingraham discussed faculty pension systems, describing various types of plans and their advantages and disadvantages. Guests were present from Creighton University and from the State Teachers College at Kearney, Nebraska.

Virginia State College (Ettrick). On May 10 Professor Richard N. Owens of George Washington University and a member of

Committee E on Organization and Conduct of Chapters attended a meeting of the recently organized chapter which was held at Virginia State College. Professor Owens discussed the objects and functions of the Association, with special emphasis on its principles of academic freedom and tenure, the functions of chapters and of committees.

West Virginia State College. On April 29 the chapter of the Association held a meeting and reception as part of the Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration of the College. Professor Benjamin L. Goode, president of the chapter, read a paper on the history and nature of the Association. Dr. Frederick Lehner introduced Professor William M. Hepburn, the Associate Secretary of the Association. Professor Hepburn spoke on the subject "Public Education and Academic Freedom and Tenure." He reviewed the rôle of the Association in advancing the interests of the teaching profession, and outlined the usual procedures in inquiries by officers of the Association into cases of alleged tenure violations brought to their attention. He emphasized the importance of these activities in publicly supported institutions. Following Professor Hepburn's talk, he discussed various problems suggested by faculty members and students who were present.

The 1941 Nominating Committee

At the spring meeting of the Council of the Association on April 18-19, the following were appointed to the 1941 Nominating Committee: Professors Quincy Wright, Political Science, University of Chicago, Chairman; George Boas, Philosophy, Johns Hopkins University; Walter G. Cady, Physics, Wesleyan University; R. G. Gustavson, Chemistry, University of Colorado; and Louise Pound, English, University of Nebraska. A tabulation of all suggestions received from Association members, pursuant to By-Law No. 1, was sent to each member of the Committee in preparation for its meeting on June 14. The report of the Committee will be published in the October *Bulletin*.

Contributors

CARROLL D. CHAMPLIN is Professor of Education at Pennsylvania State College.

ROMAN S. GORSKI is a consultant on investments and an administrator of estates and trust funds. He is the author of specialized studies in international relations and economics.

FREDERIC W. HEIMBERGER is Instructor of Political Science at Ohio State University.

HENRY W. HOLMES is Professor of Education at Harvard University and Chairman of the University Committee on Educational Relations.

MARK H. INGRAHAM is Professor of Mathematics and Chairman of the Department at the University of Wisconsin. He was President of the Association in 1938 and 1939, having previously been a member of the Council.

T. H. VAIL MOTTER is Assistant Professor of English Literature at Wellesley College. While on leave of absence this academic year as Sterling Fellow and Honorary Fellow at Yale University, he has been preparing a biography of Arthur Hallam and an edition of his writings.

JOSEPH R. STARR is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota.

CARL M. WHITE is Librarian and Director of the Library School of the University of Illinois.

HENRY M. WRISTON is President of Brown University. He is a former chairman of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the Association of American Colleges.

REVIEWS

College Plans for Retirement Income, by Rainard B. Robbins.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. ix, 253. \$2.75.

College Plans for Retirement Income is a book of major importance to the academic profession. Mr. Rainard Robbins, as Vice-President of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, has supervised the introduction of more retirement systems into our American colleges and universities than any other person. Hence we have a matter of interest to all college teachers, treated by a man who not only writes well, but who probably knows more about the subject than any other person.

Mr. Robbins deals with three main topics. First is given a short review of the history and major features of retirement systems in American colleges, next a description of the retirement plan or lack of plan of the various American colleges and universities, and finally a discussion of the provisions that Mr. Robbins considers to be desirable in a retirement plan, along with a note on the connection between retirement plans and the possible extension of the Social Security Act.

In order to read this book intelligently and critically one must understand the background and history of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America. If one thinks of this Association as merely a competing life insurance company struggling to get the trade of American colleges, one will naturally consider this book as something of an advertisement and approach it with skepticism. If one realizes, however, that this Association is really an educational foundation endowed for the purpose of benefiting American education by making possible wise retirement plans for American colleges, and that Mr. Robbins is reporting not only on the work of this foundation but on the general field which impinges upon this work, one will understand that Mr. Robbins not only has a unique background for writing this book, but brings to it, if one may use the phrase, the disinterested in-

terest of a person who wishes to further a public cause to which he has devoted his life.

When it became apparent that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching would not be able to finance an adequate retirement program even for the staffs of colleges and universities on its eligible list, it was wisely decided that instead of merely liquidating as far as possible its current obligations, some effort should be made to consolidate the gains already made in the eligible colleges and to extend to other institutions the opportunity of using at a minimum cost retirement plans adapted to their needs. Hence the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which has been working with the Carnegie Foundation in order to furnish more nearly adequate pensions to those on the "Carnegie list," helped to stimulate the founding in 1918 of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association and gave to it an initial endowment of a million dollars to cover overhead expenses. Since 1936 the Carnegie Corporation has added \$6,700,000 to this gift for the work of the Association. It is an unusual, and in the reviewer's opinion a wise, use of money for a foundation to give funds so that a large and important business may be operated in the interests of the public. The magnitude of this insurance and annuity business which is so carried on for the interests of American education can be gathered from the fact that the premiums paid the T. I. A. A. amount to more than \$10,000,000 a year, the annuity payments are nearly \$1,500,000 a year, and the contractual reserves of the company have grown to \$100,000,000. Direct expenditures by a foundation could not possibly guarantee the educational benefits that have been secured by development of the Association. Mr. Robbins would have been justified in stressing even more strongly than he has the public service of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. That he has not done so is probably due to his close connection with the organization.

All of those interested in the history of the retirement plan will wish to read the description of the growth and the later abandonment of the Carnegie Pension scheme which is given by Mr. Robbins. Nowhere else that I know of have the desirable effects of that episode been more clearly and succinctly stated than in this book. Without the prior establishment of these pensions,

the adoption of the present more adequate plans undoubtedly would have been long delayed by many institutions. Moreover, as Mr. Robbins says, "Entrance and graduation requirements were none too high in many institutions, and methods of financing left much to be desired. Many colleges were anxious to qualify for inclusion in the Carnegie family, and were thus led to greater and earlier improvement than would otherwise have materialized. A number of the stronger institutions that did not qualify under the Carnegie gift, were led to announce pension plans comparable in liberality with that of the Carnegie Foundation." This is clearly true and was advantageous to American education. A more debatable point is whether the insistence on breaking down of denominational affiliation was equally advantageous. These benefits were bought, however, at the cost of creating expectations that did not and will not fully materialize. Too hasty a condemnation of the procedure should not be made, for three factors entered into the picture that could not well have been foreseen: first, the vastly increased enrollment of our colleges, leading to increase in the size of the faculty; secondly, the increased salary scale of American universities to which the Carnegie pensions were geared; and thirdly, the more than expected longevity of annuitants, especially teachers, which has led in the last few years to many changes in annuity rates so that they have become less and less favorable to the purchaser. One cannot help but wonder, however, whether the Carnegie Foundation was not somewhat slow in realizing that it was holding out expectations that could not be fulfilled and kept its list open in order that more colleges might qualify for inclusion at a time when an adequate actuarial survey would have shown that this inclusion would mean much less than was anticipated. It is natural to be critical of the ethics of an institution which appears oblivious of the fact that it is buying public good with counterfeit coin. This may all be hindsight. It is, however, an expression of the sentiment which is current among many in the academic profession. If there is a completely adequate explanation of the prolonged period during which the Carnegie Foundation increased the list of its pensioners, it would only be an act of justice to the leaders of that Foundation to have such explanation given clearly to the profession.

In its second aspect, this book is a convenient and valuable source of information concerning the present retirement plans of our colleges and universities. The scope of the work in this regard can be seen from the fact that the retirement plans, or lack of plan, of 755 institutions are given, and that the approximate number of teachers in these institutions amounts to over 84,000. Of these, about 36,000 are covered by contributory plans using contracts of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, and about 11,000 by other contributory plans. In all, some 19,000 are not covered by any plan, and about 6200 are in institutions where no information was forthcoming. Probably most of these latter are not covered by any plan. The remaining teachers are under plans not of the contributory type. Most of these are unsatisfactory, so that it would not be far from accurate to say that half of the teachers in our institutions of higher education are covered by a satisfactory plan, and half are not. This statement is qualified by the fact that many of these plans are newly adopted and give little protection to the older men, and that in some cases the adjustment made for this group is far from adequate. The details of the retirement plans are given in a series of statistical appendices in which for various institutions are shown the date of the inauguration of the plan, the classes of faculty members covered, whether participation is voluntary or compulsory, the number of years a young man must wait before he is under the plan, the normal retirement age, and the amount that the member and the institution contribute, along with any supplementary benefit for people who were near the retirement age at the time that the plan started, or for disability. In over a hundred cases, however, these tables are not sufficient to give a complete picture, and a descriptive note is added. These descriptive notes, which cover about one hundred pages, are full and interesting. They are, on the whole, well written. The few cases of ambiguity noticed by the reviewer are due to the material furnished Mr. Robbins rather than to his presentation.

The third topic in this book, namely a description of the desirable provisions for a retirement plan, and of the relationship of the possible extension of the Social Security Act to such a plan, is the section which will be of the greatest use to members of the

American Association of University Professors. It seems to the reviewer that each chapter of the Association could well devote a meeting to a discussion of this portion of Mr. Robbins' book. This would be almost as valuable in an institution with a good retirement plan where a thorough understanding of the reasons behind the details of the system is of importance, as in an institution which is trying to develop such a plan.

It is unfortunate that many believe that retirement provisions are established solely for the benefit of the teacher. A retirement plan should be drawn up for the benefit of the institution and for the benefit of the students. The temptation to keep a teacher beyond the period of his usefulness is great if there is no satisfactory way of caring for his economic needs after retirement. As Mr. Robbins says, "Briefly, the fundamental purpose of a retirement plan is to enable the governing body of a college to part in a socially acceptable manner with individual staff members when they reach the point at which the welfare of the college will be served better by their absence than by their presence." This emphasis that Mr. Robbins puts on the educational usefulness of retirement plans is a prerequisite to all healthy thinking on the subject by either the teacher or the public.

It is the opinion of the reviewer that Mr. Robbins is correct in insisting that a desirable plan is one in which participation is compulsory, in which the institution and the individual during his period of service build up a fund from which adequate annuities may be paid after retirement at or before a fixed age, and in which no equity is forfeited if the individual leaves an institution before retirement.

No portion of the whole book is more timely or more important than that which deals with the withdrawal and death settlement provisions. Some colleges have adopted the seemingly attractive provision that the contribution made by the college be forfeited if the individual leaves the institution to go to another place. This is wholly undesirable. Mr. Robbins says, "Conviction is widespread that the best interests of higher education require a free interchange of professional talent between educational institutions. Anything that tends to hamper this interchange is frowned upon; and it is clearly recognized that a substantial pros-

pect of old-age income that depends for its realization upon continuation of services in a particular institution interferes seriously with a free interchange of professional talent. As a rule, when a college official clearly understands this idea, it is sufficient to convince him of the necessity of arranging for retirement accumulation to follow staff members whenever they move from one institution to another." And again, "Without doubt there are times when the further development of an individual is possible only in a different environment. Under such circumstances all parties concerned will gain by any means that facilitates the change. Accumulations for retirement income that vest in the individual furnish such a means," and once more, "Perhaps we can never completely eliminate the necessity for judgment on the part of one person or a few persons that will vitally affect individuals; but it seems wholly inexcusable, where necessity does not so dictate, to lay plans deliberately under which we can foresee that the fate of individuals may depend on the board's sense of conservatism, personal likes or dislikes of the individual making the recommendations, factional divisions in the board itself, or the views of a dominating personality on the board. With faith and hope that better motives usually prevail, we should not deliberately set up a system that is vulnerable in this respect."

Few things would do as much for American education as the general adoption of retirement plans uniform in broad outline and providing that the complete benefits which have accrued to a teacher belong to him, no matter where he goes. This would facilitate the individual in finding the place where he is most useful rather than freeze him to a particular locality by means of vested interest he would lose in going elsewhere.

The recognition of the fundamental principles of compulsory participation, fixed retirement age, and non-forfeiture of benefits must be supplemented by careful attention to details.

Many institutions do not include in their retirement plans the members of the staff who have had only one, two, three, or sometimes even five years of service. As Mr. Robbins points out, a short waiting period does little harm, and may possibly keep an institution from having too many accounts. However, such waiting periods should be kept very short or eliminated. With the

present falling rate of interest, and with a contributory plan which calls for retention of five per cent of the salary of the individual, matched by an equal payment on the part of the institution, it is necessary for a person to participate during practically all of his teaching career in order to have a satisfactory retirement allowance.

It is difficult to determine at what age retirement should become compulsory. In regard to this point, Mr. Robbins describes plans actually in operation and some of the arguments that must be considered before determining the retiring age, but gives no definite recommendation. It is the reviewer's opinion that a compulsory retirement age of seventy is about the best that can be recommended, though if he had to shade it either way it would be down rather than up. Seldom has a lower retirement age than sixty-five been suggested. It would seem that too much experienced ability is lost by retiring everyone at sixty-five. Moreover, a study of an annuity plan which calls for contributions from both the institution and the individual in proportion to the salary shows that on the average the retiring allowance at seventy will be about fifty per cent more than at sixty-five. This is due to three factors. First, the increased amount on hand from additional contributions during the five-year period; secondly, the increased amount on hand due to interest earned during the five-year period; and thirdly, the larger annuity that can be bought per thousand dollars at seventy than at sixty-five. On the other hand, colleges with a retirement age above seventy often find that as a person gets older beyond this point he resents retirement more rather than less, and that on the average there is a falling off of energy and ability marked enough at seventy to justify retirement at that age. It may fairly be asked whether there are not many people between sixty-five and seventy who should be retired, and whether a rule which allows everyone to teach until seventy may not be unwise for our educational system. On the other hand, questions of tenure are involved when there is option on the part of the administration to retire a man earlier than the fixed retirement age. The reviewer believes that college and university teachers together with administrators should make a careful study of this topic and perhaps endeavor to find a means of pro-

protecting academic freedom and the advantages of tenure while making it possible to have discretionary retirement at an age somewhat younger than the fixed maximum.

Under the heading "contributions, benefits and methods of funding," much valuable advice on the financial management of any retirement plan is given. It is suggested that we may be forced to move to a higher percentage than five per cent from the institution in order to make up for falling interest rates if we are to maintain adequate retirement annuities.

Mr. Robbins maintains that colleges can well afford to participate in the benefits of the Social Security Act if they are given the privilege of doing so. He points out that the amount of retired benefits under the Social Security Plan would be so small that the colleges would still wish to make additional provisions to meet the problem of retirement. It might well be that participation under the Social Security Act would just about make up for the falling rate of interest so that this in addition to a contributory plan calling for five per cent of the salary from the member and an equal amount from the institution would be desirable.

In his book, *College Plans for Retirement Income*, Mr. Robbins has made a major contribution to higher education; a contribution, however, that will only reach its fullest fruition if it is carefully studied by administrators and faculty members alike. The American Association of University Professors might do much both through its chapters and through the national organization to further such consideration.

University of Wisconsin

MARK H. INGRAHAM

Problems of Adult Education: Seventeenth Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, edited by I. L. Kandel. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940. Pp. xiii, 397. \$3.70.

The publication of this international survey of adult education is timely. No one today questions the importance of this field of study, and educators invariably regard the defense crisis as an

opportune moment for securing some of the improved instructional equipment that has long been sought. Adult education is one of the least well defined of all our common educational terms, this being due in part to the inherent difficulty involved in achieving a satisfactory definition and in the almost infinite variety of activities that currently carry the professional tag of adult education.

Dr. Kandel deserves more than the customary praise that has been bestowed annually on him since 1924 for this invaluable series. The 1940 Yearbook has been the most difficult of all to compile, and we look into the near future with little faith and low expectancy, for which reason the present volume becomes exceptionally precious as serviceable literature in the field of Comparative Education. Here are reports of adult education as it is conceived and administered in 15 countries. The systems are described and the major issues discussed for the following nations—Argentine Republic, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, England, France, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Scotland, Sweden, the Union of South Africa, and the United States.

Something of the character of each of the 15 systems of education is reflected in the manner in which adult education is conducted. The observation is made that where primary schools fail to measure up to their desired stature the attention given to adult instruction is above the average; and it is not true as a rule that the better a nation's elementary school program the more thoroughly developed will be its department of adult education. It is clearly apparent that schools for adults thrive best where the social, political, and economic situation is stimulating enough to arouse a keen concern for this aspect of the total educational organization. Adult education calls forth the greatest enthusiasm where it springs spontaneously from the sincere desire of a large number to improve their intellectual, cultural, and social quality of life.

The history of adult education has never been adequately outlined. A brief investigation reveals a wide range of interests and experiments, sponsored by a variety of institutions and led by men and women with varying philosophies of education. It has become a well established fact that adult education is an important feature of our cultural life—a creative factor of increasing impor-

tance in our national culture. There is little doubt that our concept of the meaning of education will become enriched as we are made more familiar with the facts surrounding the recent expansion of our adult education program. Here is a place for a dissertation study of great value, providing subject matter of constructive significance to everyone eager to elevate the standard of our American citizenship.

The Greek Sophists were the teachers of adults, rising to a level of philosophical and educational importance to meet the need for personal leadership, dramatic ability, and oratorical power. The ancient Jews patronized houses of learning that gave instruction in the meaning of the traditional Hebrew learning, numerous adults being thus motivated to continue their education far beyond that available through the official schools. The ancient Roman Forum was likewise definitely an institution for the mingling of the best minds and for the enlightenment of the Roman masses. The New England Town Meeting was our first development in the field of adult education, an institution that has several counterparts in our contemporary American life. The Industrial Revolution in Great Britain and a series of political crises in Denmark were responsible for the inauguration of adult education measures in those countries. The Scandinavian countries as a group have long displayed unusual interest in the continuing education of their people and in the practice of self-instruction as a life-long hobby. In the totalitarian countries the current procedure is to impart political indoctrination under the caption of adult education. The use of museums, libraries, parks, and camps in Germany and Russia is an excellent example of this device.

An extensively employed slogan is—"Open a school and close a jail." The truth of this claim emerges as we observe the gradual overthrow of the fallacious notion that the beginning of adulthood marks a drastic reduction in a person's educability. Some of our most competent and productive students are several years the senior of the average collegian. Preoccupation with the problems of the mind would be one of the best agencies for keeping our younger adults from plotting social mischief. Evil is crowded out by the inrush of noble thoughts and creative inspiration. We are challenged by the serious lack of appropriate content and

efficient methods of instruction in prosecuting our enlarged program of adult education. Dr. Kandel makes it clear that there is a need for better adult education—both as to quantity and quality. He is convinced that a more wide-spread distribution of general information and a more universal attainment of vocational skills will result in a higher type of citizenship and a more substantial brand of tolerance than the nations of the world have so far been able to exercise. Right now the United States is setting a fine example of encouraging liberal thought and personal development among its people. It is Dr. Kandel's implied thesis that in both war-time and peace we should emphasize and foster adult education to the limit of our resources available for that purpose.

Pennsylvania State College

CARROLL D. CHAMPLIN

The Administration of College and University Endowments, by Charles Richard Sattgast. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940. Pp. 125. \$1.85.

In this dynamic world of today, the supervision of funds is not an easy problem. Nowhere is this more true than in the field of investments in the endowed colleges and universities. This is the subject of Dr. Sattgast's highly interesting and timely contribution. Dr. Sattgast analyzes the pressing problems confronting the endowed colleges and universities today, and presents fundamental principles necessary for the proper administration and investment of funds. The material for his study was secured from forty-five American institutions of higher education, carefully selected to provide a representative sample of all types of endowed institutions geographically distributed over the northern half of the United States, covering their portfolios for the years 1929, 1933, and 1936, and was limited to an investigation of the responsibility of obtaining the maximum income which may be maintained continuously with a minimum of fluctuation. The invested funds ranged from less than one million to over ten million dollars.

From his study of the portfolios, it was found that a higher rate of income and a minimum amount of fluctuation in income were associated with colleges and universities having the following

pattern in their investment operations: (1) investment committees made up of "specialists" in finance, as against laymen (the difference being a yield of 4.01 per cent as against 2.38 per cent); (2) facilities for doing investment research; (3) funds in excess of \$1,000,000; (4) classifiable as privately supported non-church related institutions; (5) funds managed by committees who maintain reserves against losses in principal; (6) endowment funds not used as collateral to secure loans; (7) portfolio properly diversified by giving careful consideration to quality, irrespective of the size of the fund. The analysis revealed a predominating trend among the forty-five colleges and universities toward a reduction in the percentage of bonds with an increase in the holdings of common stocks. Institutions following this trend had wisely adjusted their portfolios to the economic situation as it existed from 1933-1936 and thus were able to receive significantly higher rates of income than institutions that did not make such purchases.

The author of this book has done a unique piece of work in collecting data regarding the endowments, and the administration of these endowments, and in writing on a subject on which very little has been written. His conclusions and recommendations should be very helpful to administrators of college endowments.

The investment policy Dr. Sattgast suggests should *also* take into account the fact that interest rate fluctuations in the future will depend on the course of uncertainties which now hamper a normal revival of capital demand. Universities and colleges, like other institutions, are still benefiting from the fact that they hold a substantial volume of old securities bearing relatively high yields. But, as these mature or are called for repayment, they are replaced by low-rate issues. Thus the effects of current trends are cumulative, and as the average return on all holdings gradually approaches present levels of rates now available in the market, which are extremely low, the present income problem will become acute. The significance of the problem of low interest rates may be illustrated as follows: If the rate of return on a \$10,000,000 endowment declines from five per cent to three per cent, the income shrinks \$200,000. To replace this income, with current yields at 2.72 per cent (average yield on triple AAA corporate securities, Moody, December 28, 1940), would require the raising of an addi-

tional endowment of \$7,352,942—a very large sum even in prosperous years.

With falling interest rates, defaults in principal and interest, lack of new outlets for funds, or from matured, called bonds, new revenue legislation and the limit placed by the national government on tax-free gifts that may be made out of income, the question arises: How shall the institutions of higher education in this country best cope with the difficult duty of successfully and safely directing their grants in the light of the discouraging prospects of the future before them? In these uncertain times the supervision of funds is a difficult problem. In deciding to divert funds from high-grade bonds into selected second-grade bonds and common stocks with earnings vitality and high excess profit tax exemption, the need for expert guidance and advice is obvious, as constant vigilance is vitally necessary for observation of growth indications, as well as for *Timing* to buy on recessions.

In view of all these uncertainties it is helpful to have Dr. Sattgast's book—a very helpful contribution on the analysis of the income problem of college endowments for the years 1929, 1933, and 1936—presented so clearly and so thoroughly. Although written primarily for those who are interested in the administration of college and university endowment funds—trustees, presidents, professors, students, and alumni—the book should carry its important message to a wider audience, all who are interested in the administration of institutions in many fields whose common problem is where and how to get the best results out of investment funds in these parlous times.

New York City

ROMAN S. GORSKI

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership is by the Committee on Admission of Members following nomination by one Active Member of the Association who need not be on the faculty of the same institution as the nominee. Election cannot take place until thirty days after the nomination is published in the *Bulletin*. Nomination forms, circulars of information, and other information concerning the Association may be procured by writing to the General Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

(a) *Active*. To become an Active Member, it is necessary to hold a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an eligible institution and be devoting at least half time to teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(b) *Junior*. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(c) *Associate*. Associate Members include those members who, ceasing to be eligible for Active or Junior membership because their work has become primarily administrative, are transferred to the Associate list with the approval of the Council. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(d) *Emeritus*. Any Active Member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus membership. Emeritus members pay no dues but may if they desire receive the *Bulletin*, at \$1.00 a year.

(e) *Life Membership*. The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from Active, Junior, and Associate

Members for Life membership, the amount to be determined in each case on an actuarial basis. This includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Nominations for Membership

The following 254 nominations for Active membership and 12 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admission of Members consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; R. H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; W. O. Sypher, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

Active

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, J. Herman Johnson; University of Alabama, Forrest C. Blood, Jr., Robert Lorenz; Arizona State Teachers College (Flagstaff), Lyle E. Mehlenbacher, Arden B. Olsen; Arkansas State Teachers College (Conway), J. B. Wilson; University of Arkansas, June Paulson; Ashland College, Allen R. Thompson; Atlanta University, Joseph A. Pierce; Baldwin-Wallace College, Ned M. Russell; Ball State Teachers College, Frances R. Botsford, Nathan H. Woodruff; Bard College, Abbot E. Smith; Bethany College (West Virginia), William H. Spragens; Billings Polytechnic Institute, Guy L. Barnes; Bowling Green State University, Wayne S. Huffman, Arthur F. Schalk, Jr.; Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Howard J. Bell, Jr., Ralph N. Johanson, John H. Shroyer, Daphne B. Swartz, Howard M. Teeter, Tipton M. Westfall; Brooklyn College, Helen C. Coombs; Centenary College of Louisiana, A. J. Middlebrooks; Chapman College, Violet G. Stone, John H. Walker; The City College (Commerce Center), William M. Girden, Louis Weinberg; University of Colorado, Leo V. Aspinwall, Edward C. King, Leslie Lewis, John B. Schoolland; Columbia University, Franklin Dunham, Will French, Arthur T. Jersild, F. Ernest Johnson, Clarence Linton, R. Bruce

Raup, Alice W. Spieseke, Eleanor M. Witmer; **Connecticut College**, John F. Moore; **University of Connecticut**, Elmer O. Anderson, Benjamin A. Brown, Hugh S. Cannon, Erwin Jungherr, Lisbeth Macdonald, Edward W. Manchester, Rex Morthland, Mason T. Record, Harold Scott; **Cornell University**, Mary E. Duthie, Mary W. Neugent; **De Paul University**, Imre Horner; **Drake University**, Mary C. Hillis; **Elmhurst College**, Harvey De Bruine, Mary M. Handel; **Evansville College**, Adolph W. Aleck; **Florida State College for Women**, John E. Jacobi; **University of Florida**, George F. Baughman; **Georgia School of Technology**, Jesse C. Brown, Henry K. Stanford, Maurice A. Strickland, Noah Warren, Charles F. Wysong; **Georgia State Woman's College**, Herbert F. Kraft, Marie Motter; **University of Georgia**, Ludwig R. Kuhn; **Green Mountain Junior College**, Susan J. Ellithorp, Kenneth B. Holmes, V. Esther Lane, Elsie H. Lewis, Eunice C. Smith-Goard; **University of Hawaii**, N. B. Beck, Laura V. Schwartz, Marshall W. Stearns; **Hendrix College**, Benjamin Owen, Marian Owen; **Hunter College**, Lincoln Reis; **University of Idaho (Southern Branch)**, Oscar Kaplan, Carl W. McIntosh, Jr.; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, Lee F. Supple; **Illinois State Teachers College (Eastern)**, Robert A. Warner; **University of Illinois**, Herman B. Chase; **Indiana University**, Kenneth N. Cameron; **Iowa State College**, Iver Johnson, Elbert G. Smith, Oscar G. Woody; **John Tarleton Agricultural College**, Hal C. Doremus; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, George D. Culler, Mary J. Reid; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Marion I. Whitney; **University of Kansas**, Hilden Gibson, Siegfried Mickelson, George Waggoner, Charles Wolfson; **Kent State University**, Kenneth Byler; **Knox College**, Ralph M. Sargent; **Lincoln University (Missouri)**, William H. Hamlin; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, Grady D. Price; **Louisiana State University**, John L. Keeley, Donald W. Magoon; **Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart**, Julio A. Mira; **Mary Washington College**, Almont Lindsey; **University of Maryland**, L. Webster Frayer; **Memphis State College**, Arthur W. Brewington, Robert E. L. Crane, Jr., Grover H. Hayden; **University of Miami**, Conley R. Addington, Georgia M. Barrett, John A. McLeland, William C. Smith, Henry S. West; **Michigan State Normal College**, Maud Hagle; **Mills College**, David M. French, Barbara Garcia, Dominic P. Rotunda, Leona E. Young; **University of Minnesota**, E. Fred Koller, Earl G. Latham, Harry C. Lawton, Royse P. Murphy, Stefan-Albrecht Riesenfeld, Charles E. Skinner; **University of Missouri**, Karl R. Bopp, Frederick A. Courts, J. Edward Gerald, Mae Kelly, Ellsworth A. MacLeod, Hurley L. Motley, Bertis A. Westfall, John B. Wolf; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, H. Richmond Davis; **University of Nebraska**, Carl E. Rosenquist; **Newberry College**, Clarence McK. Smith, Jr.; **University of North Carolina**, William Peery, Oscar K. Rice; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina**, Vance T. Littlejohn; **Northwestern University**, Vernon G. Lippitt, George A. Maney, Berneice Prisk, Walter V. Schaefer, Helen Shacter; **Norwich University**, John A. McGuire; **Occidental College**, L. Reed Brantley; **Ohio State University**, Kenneth M. Abbott, Harold Fawcett, Lou LaBrant, Margaret Willis, Alden R. Winter; **Ohio University**, Karl E. Witzler; **Ohio**

Wesleyan University, James H. Scott; University of Omaha, Martin W. Bush, Elizabeth E. Kaho, John W. Kurtz, Lawrence T. Peterson, Cheryl H. Prewett, V. Gregory Rosemont, Donald E. Tope, Hyatt H. Waggoner, A. Dayle Wallace, Walter A. Weisskopf, T. Harry Williams; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (California), O. Ray Bontrager, George S. Hart, Horace Montgomery, Samuel M. Neagley; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Lock Haven), Jay F. Stemple, W. Howard Yost; University of Pennsylvania, W. Norman Brown, William C. McDermott, Malcolm G. Preston; Princeton University, Joseph A. Brandt, Roderic H. Davison, Luman H. Tenney, A. P. Ushenko; College of Puget Sound, Marvin R. Schafer; Queens College (New York), Douglas Spencer; Queens College (North Carolina), Mary Denny; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Bela A. Lengyel; Russell Sage College, Frank E. W. Barnes, Gertrude M. Fleming, Elizabeth E. Kent; Rutgers University, Houston Peterson; St. Francis College, F. Glenn Pontzer; St. Louis University, William H. Bauer, Theodore C. Helmreich, Alberto Pescetto-Schiavetti, Luigi Sandri, Albert Scholz; San Bernardino Valley Junior College, Dorathea Frahm; San Francisco State College, Baxter M. Geeting, Gerald T. White; Seton Hill College, Carl P. Hensler, Joseph A. Rauterkus, Peter L. Vissat; Southern Methodist University, James F. Cronin, Edyth M. Renshaw, Alan L. Ritter, David W. Starr; Stephens College, Barbara Bartley, Margaret H. Benson, Robert E. Carson, Albert Christ-Janer, John C. Crighton, Yolanda Floripe, Margaret Hinson, Leota L. Johns, Ottelia J. Kintzel, Zetta Lind, A. Laurence Mortensen, Margaret Nelson, L. Lee Poynter, Roger Schwenn; Texas Christian University, Eula L. Carter; Texas State College for Women, Gladys McGill, Anthony C. Walvoord; Texas State Teachers College (East), Eleanor C. Boyd; Trinity College (Connecticut), Thomas L. Downs, Jr., Laurence Lafore, Warren Lothrop, R. Walker Scott; Tufts College, Nathaniel H. Knight; University of Tulsa, Robert M. Smith; Vassar College, Martha Alter, Leila C. Barber, Richard A. E. Brooks, John Crouch, Hallie F. Davis, Ruth J. Hofrichter, Alma Luckau, Catharine Meyer, Homer Pearson, John W. Peirce, Agnes Rindge, Robert Scranton, Eleanor M. Tilton; University of Vermont, Leon W. Dean, George L. Millikan; Virginia State College for Negroes, Beatrice C. Buford, John V. Parnell, Jr.; Virginia State Teachers College (Farmville), Florence H. Stubbs; Virginia Union University, Limas D. Wall; Central Washington College of Education, George W. Mabee, Henry J. Whitney; Western Washington College of Education, Paul Woodring; West Virginia State College, Herman G. Canady, Gladys Johnson; Western College, Merle B. Ackerman, Ruth Bracher, Helen Potter; Western Reserve University, Grace L. Coyle; Winthrop College, Lois G. Black; University of Wisconsin, William H. Peterson.

Junior

University of Connecticut, Edgar Zwilling; University of Kansas, Henry Van Swearingen; University of Omaha, Marian McLaren. Not in Accredited

Institutional Connection, William H. Barnard (Graduate work, University of Chicago), Upland, Ind.; W. Lou Berkness (M.A., Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College), Portales, N. Mex.; Alfred B. Gaarder (M.A., National University of Mexico), Portales, N. Mex.; Floyd Golden (M.A., University of Colorado), Portales, N. Mex.; Ralph R. King (Graduate work, Colorado State College of Education), Portales, N. Mex.; William A. McLaughlin (Graduate work, University of Colorado), Portales, N. Mex.; Edwin E. Nihiser (M.A., Columbia University), Brockport, N. Y.; Deward H. Reed (M.A., University of Colorado), Portales, N. Mex.; Harry F. Taylor (M.A., University of Denver), Portales, N. Mex.

Supplementary List of Nominations

Active (52)

Brown University, Richard Blandau; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, Kenneth F. Baker, Ralph Byrne, Jr., Isabel P. Creed, A. Gerhard Eger, Roland H. Harvey, Clinton N. Howard, Louis K. Koontz, Hans Reichenbach, T. Y. Thomas, Frederick A. Valentine, Daniel Vandraegen, Euphemia R. Worthington, Max Zorn; **University of Cincinnati**, Edwin H. Zeydel; **Columbia University**, Roy N. Anderson, John C. Flanagan, Martin Y. Munson; **Emory University**, Norman L. Matthews; **University of Georgia**, A. Elizabeth Todd; **Green Mountain Junior College**, Allan S. Everest; **University of Hawaii**, Charles S. Bouslog; **Hofstra College**, Charles E. Stevens, Jr.; **Kentucky State Teachers College (Eastern)**, A. Anna Schnieb; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, James J. Barry, Paul S. Delaup, Mary E. Dichmann; **Louisiana State University**, Merrill W. Everhart; **Memphis State College**, Howard J. Steere; **University of Michigan**, Margaret Bell, Wilfrid T. Dempster; **Mills College**, F. Carlton Ball, John H. Furbay, Ruth E. Gillard, Otto J. Maenchen; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, Blanche Skinner; **New York University**, Roberts Rugh; **University of Newark**, C. Herman Martin; **Ohio University**, King Adamson, Keith B. MacKichan; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (California)**, Ruth L. Myers; **San Bernardino Valley Junior College**, Edmund J. Robins; **Smith College**, Alfred Y. Fisher, Elizabeth S. Hobbs, Harold E. Israel, Wolfgang H. Kraus; **Vassar College**, Theodore Erck, Maria de'N. Piccirilli; **University of Washington**, Maxim von Brevern; **West Virginia State College**, C. Callaway Ross; **Winthrop College**, Vera McNair; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (La Crosse)**, Merton J. Lyon.

Junior (1)

Virginia State College for Negroes, Lucille E. Penister.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election of 360 Active and 22 Junior Members as follows:

Active

University of Akron, Audra Tenney; Alabama College, M. Ziolkowski; Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Glenn A. Scott; University of Alabama, John W. Chisholm, Jr., Carl C. Sartain; American University, Ruberta M. Olds; Amherst College, George A. Craig; Arizona State Teachers College (Tempe), C. E. Southern; Arkansas State College, Warren W. Nedrow; University of Arkansas, Leslie M. Weetman; Ball State Teachers College, Grace E. Brandt; Baylor University, Robert W. Lackey, Robert W. Severance, G. Edwin Waggener; Berea College, Charles N. Shutt; Brooklyn College, Lewis G. Crosby, Louie M. Miner; University of California (Los Angeles), John H. Hollowell; Central YMCA College, Richard W. Jones; University of Chicago, James Brown, Robert J. Havighurst, T. R. Hogness, Cyril O. Houle, Louis N. Katz, Melvin H. Knisely, Bernard M. Loomer, H. Necheles, Samuel Soskin, Arthur R. Turner, Friedrich Wassermann; University of Cincinnati, Hilda Buttenwieser, Samuel L. Eby, Edward A. Henry, Harry L. Miller, Otto C. von Schlichten, William C. Taylor; The City College (New York), Ross Scanlan; Coe College, Dell G. Hitchner; University of Colorado, Rowland W. Dunham, Fritz L. Hoffmann; Columbia University, Joseph E. Mayer; Concord State Teachers College, Roy T. Hickman; Cornell College, Rebecca Green, Edwin C. Rozwenc; Cornell University, George P. Adams, Jr., Faith Fenton, Horace E. Whiteside; Dakota Wesleyan University, Howard H. Brightman, Carl W. Landahl; University of Delaware, Paul Dolan, Charles N. Lanier, Jr., Herbert Newman; DePauw University, Frederick L. Bergmann, James Cason, James Y. Causey, Robert Dinkel, Wisner Kinne, Merton H. Rapp, William H. Strain, Llewellyn N. Wiley; University of Dubuque, Anna Aitchison, Jacob Bajema, Alois Bárta, James W. Beach, Blanche Bock, Hermann S. Ficke, H. Clifford Fox, Raymond French, John A. Garber, Maurine Happ, Hans Kirchner, Francis W. Kracher, Reynold McKeown, Edward Nehls, Klaas J. Stratemeier, Paul Vail, Anson E. Van Eaton, C. Vin White, Edward Wight, William B. Zuker; Duquesne University, Wilfred D. Rush; Elmhurst College, Werner Richter, Erna Stech; Florida State College for Women, Gladys Fawley; Furman University, J. Carlyle Ellett; University of Georgia, Irma M. Hicks; Harris Teachers College, Cecilia L. Fine; Hastings College, Hayes M. Fuhr; Haverford College, Carl B. Allendoerfer, Theodore B. Hetzel, Clayton W. Holmes; Hofstra College, Eleanor D. Blodgett, Cullen B. Colton, Oscar G. Darlington, Joseph A. Kershaw, Robert L. Thompson; Hunter College, Muriel Farrell; University of Idaho (Southern Branch), Ralph R. Rowell; Illinois Institute of Technology, Judson F. Lee; Illinois State Normal University (Southern), Ronald Lippitt; Illinois State Teachers College (Eastern), William G. Wood, Rose Zeller; Indiana State Teachers College, Madelyn

Crawford, Frederick Sorensen, Sylvan A. Yager; **Indiana University**, Alfred Manes; **Iowa State College**, Robert Orlovich; **John B. Stetson University**, James J. Lenoir; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Stephen J. Turille; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Edwina Fowler, L. C. Heckert, Ramon W. Kessler, Minerva Wootton; **University of Kansas**, H. Berry Ivy, Hiram H. Lesar; **University of Kentucky**, Stephen Diachun, Edith G. Grundmeier, Robert N. Jeffrey; **Keuka College**, Harold F. Archibald; **Lake Forest College**, R. Miller Upton; **Lawrence College**, Lynn Beyer, Thomas Hamilton, Anne P. Jones; **Lenoir Rhyne College**, Ruth Friedrich; **Louisiana State University**, John S. Gambs, Ruth Price, Murphy P. Rogers; **University of Louisville**, Noble H. Kelley; **Luther College**, Sherman Hoslett; **McGill University**, Francis R. Scott; **MacMurray College for Women**, McKendree M. Blair, Volney Hampton; **Marshall College**, John C. Fors; **Mary Washington College**, Herman Reichenbach, Arthur L. Vogelback; **University of Maryland**, Eduard Uhlenhuth; **Maryville College**, Archibald F. Pieper; **Memphis State College**, L. C. Austin, Alice M. Chappell, Zack Curlin, Henry M. Frizell, Robert D. Highfill, Owen R. Hughes, Rayburn W. Johnson, Alma Mays, Clarence E. Moore, Joseph H. Parks, Carol Robertson; **University of Miami**, K. Malcolm Beal, Frances Hovey Bergh, John H. Clouse, William P. Dismukes, Adaline S. Donahoo, Robert B. Downes, Elmer V. Hjort, Natalie G. Lawrence, Ernest M. McCracken, Sidney B. Maynard, Mary B. Merritt, E. Morton Miller, Leonard R. Muller, Melanie R. Rosborough, Samuel Saslaw, Alexandre J. deSeabra, H. Franklin Williams, Reinhold P. Wolff; **Michigan State College**, George W. Radimersky, Burdette Stampely; **Michigan State Normal College**, John R. Alden, Fred J. Ericson, Wallace Magoon, Doris L. Porter; **University of Michigan**, Ernest F. Barker, Ora S. Duffendack, Charles F. Meyer; **University of Minnesota**, Josephine E. Collins, Rex W. Cox, Selmer A. Engene, W. P. Larson, Milton Levine, Howard D. Myers, Warren C. Waite; **Mississippi State College**, Glover Moore, Erwin H. Price; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southwest)**, Robert M. Howe; **University of Missouri**, William G. Stobie; **Mt. Holyoke College**, Elizabeth M. Boyd; **Muskingum College**, Thearle A. Barnhart, Anna J. Closser, Jane R. Hazzard, Sidney K. Shear, William A. Sutton; **University of Nebraska**, Norman H. Cromwell; **University of Nevada**, Charles Duncan, William O. Holmes; **University of New Hampshire**, Harry H. Hall, Howard R. Jones, Lewis C. Swain, David Walter; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Newark)**, James F. Glenn; **New York Medical College**, Alfred Angrist; **New York University**, Raymond I. Maire; **North Carolina College for Negroes**, Hilda Weiss; **Northwestern University**, Ralph B. Baldwin, Leon A. Bosch, Claude Buxton, John F. Calvert, Charlotte A. Colwell, Everett Edmondson, Helmut von Erffa, Smith Freeman, Laurence D. Frizzell, Sanford R. Gifford, Jean H. Hagstrum, Joseph P. Harris, William C. Holbrook, G. Donald Hudson, Ruth W. Jung, Fritz Kaufmann, Edward W. Kimbark, Alvina Krause, Clark G. Kuebler, Maurice B. Lagaard, Curtis D. MacDougall, Stewart Y. McMullen, Horace W. Magoun, Guillermo Mendoza, Moody E. Prior, Karl F. Robinson, J. Howard Schultz, Frederick S. Siebert, Dulany Terrett, Mason E. Wescott, George

K. Yacorzynski; Oberlin College, John W. Kurtz; Occidental College, George W. Zinke; Ohio State University, Wilbur C. Batchelor, Paul C. Kitchin, Floyd S. Markham, Stockton Raymond, Dorothy Sumption, Mary Yost; Ohio University, Carleton Clakin, James B. Golden; Ohio Wesleyan University, Charles J. Tesar; University of Oklahoma, J. Kester Svendsen; University of Omaha, Mildred Gearhart; Oregon State College, Clifford Grobstein; University of Oregon, Roy C. Andrews, Lawrence S. Bee, Celestine J. Sullivan, Jr., Franklin D. Walker; Pennsylvania State College, Florence E. Taylor; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Lock Haven), Charles Cox, Kenton F. Vickery, Margaret E. Waldron; University of Pennsylvania, John S. Adams, Jr., A. Williams Postel, George O. Seiver; University of Pittsburgh, Ruth Smalley; Princeton University, Frederick B. Agard, Hereward L. Cooke, Francis R. B. Godolphin, E. Harris Harbison, Hans Jaeger, Malcolm MacLaren, Jr., Whitney J. Oates, Robert R. Palmer, Richard Stillwell, Joseph R. Strayer; College of Puget Sound, Arthur L. Frederick; Purdue University, John A. Bromer, J. Franklin Carlson, Thomas K. Sanders, Allan A. Smith, George R. Thornton; Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Blanche Couëssin, Helen Peak; Reed College, Karl Aschenbrenner, Ruth G. Collier; Ripon College, Ludwig Freund; Rockford College, Helene Magaret; Rose Polytechnic Institute, George E. Hansche; Russell Sage College, George P. Borglum, George Cole; St. John's University, David S. Edgar, Jr., Harold F. Sylvester; St. Louis University, Nelson J. Wade; St. Mary's College (Indiana), Sister Miriam Joseph; San Bernardino Valley Junior College, Tempe E. Allison; San Francisco State College, Carlo L. Lastrucci; Santa Barbara State College, W. Charles Redding; University of Scranton, Frank J. O'Hara; Shurtleff College, Helen Hilton; Smith College, Priscilla P. Van der Poel; Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota), Mary M. Wills; University of South Dakota, Einar Leifson, Earle Sparks; Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Benjamin Kaplan; Sul Ross State Teachers College, Jerome L. Kerby; Swarthmore College, Luzern G. Livingston; Syracuse University, H. Harrison Clarke, William J. Lloyd, John L. Mothershead, Jr., John H. Shaw; Temple University, Walter D. Ferguson; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Harry L. Kidd, Jr.; Texas Christian University, James H. Dougherty; Texas State College for Women, Marjorie Baltzel, Thurmond L. Morrison; Texas State Teachers College (East), R. Vernon Jones, Earl N. Saucier; University of Texas, Alvan L. Chapman; University of Toledo, Thomas F. Gibson; Transylvania College, Jack R. Bryden; Tulane University, Arthur P. Miles, William R. Pabst, Jr.; University of Tulsa, Lawrence Benninger, Harold Enlows, Chris P. Keim, Homer J. Smith; United States Naval Academy, Harry C. Buchholtz, Raymond E. Kerr, Jr., Paul Miller, John A. Quensé; Vassar College, James B. Ross; Medical College of Virginia, Archibald H. Fee; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Raymond Nelson; Virginia State College for Negroes, Bernard F. Dabney, Anna E. Owens, Louis H. Schuster, Zarella R. Turner; Virginia State Teachers College (Farmville), Bessie H. Jeter; Central Washington College of Education, Cloice E. Myers, Jessie L. Puckett; University of Washington, Arthur N. Lorig, Ruth M. Wilson; Wayne University, Joseph J. Como, Alfred Nelson,

James M. Winfield; Wellesley College, Mary E. Prentiss; West Virginia University, Eldor Marten; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), C. Dorothy Kirkbride; Wheaton College (Massachusetts), M. Elizabeth Maxfield; Williams College, Max Flowers; University of Wisconsin, Vernor C. Finch, Robert M. Neal; University of Wyoming, Howland H. Bailey, Leslie S. Crawford, Hail Fischer, Edward G. Fisher, John A. Gorman, Grace Irvine, Leon King, Weldon Litsey, Veva Lukin, Hubert McCormick, Howard Spieth, James C. Stratton, Milton Zagel.

Transfers from Junior to Active

Hamilton College, Thomas H. LeDuc; Kalamazoo College, Edward B. Hinckley; University of Newark, William L. Nunn, Herbert P. Woodward.

Junior

University of Kansas, William F. Blair; Northwestern University, George F. Brennan; Virginia State College for Negroes, Elizabeth M. Anderson. **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, Arthur J. O. Anderson (Ph.D., University of Southern California), Portales, N. Mex.; Plumer M. Bailey (M.A., University of Colorado), Portales, N. Mex.; Arvel Branscum (M.A., Texas Technological College), Portales, N. Mex.; Gillian Buchanan (M.A., Columbia University), Portales, N. Mex.; Vena A. Clark (M.S., Iowa State College), Portales, N. Mex.; Alfred Crofts (Ph.D., Stanford University), Portales, N. Mex.; Martin W. Fleck (M.S., University of New Mexico), Portales, N. Mex.; William C. Frishe (M.S., University of Cincinnati), Rochester, Minn.; Howard Hurmence (M.S., Texas Technological College), Portales, N. Mex.; Ivan N. McCollom (Ed.D., Colorado State College of Education), Portales, N. Mex.; Roy MacKay (Ph.D., University of Michigan), Portales, N. Mex.; Harold E. Mehrens (Ed.D., University of Southern California), Portales, N. Mex.; Horace G. Moore (A.M., Texas Technological College), Portales, N. Mex.; Andrew F. Ogle (Ph.D., Colorado State College of Education), Portales, N. Mex.; W. T. Pickel (M.S., University of California), Portales, N. Mex.; H. Weston Robbins (Graduate work, University of Nebraska), Portales, N. Mex.; Olga Saffry (M.S., Kansas State College), Portales, N. Mex.; Edward W. Slockbower (M.A., Colorado State College of Education), Portales, N. Mex.; Oral M. Williamson (M.S., Kansas State College), Portales, N. Mex.